



## FINAL REPORT

# Evaluating the Effectiveness of Regional Migration Program Models on Providing Assistance to Vulnerable Migrants

U.S. Department of State  
Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration



## ADVANCING DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS

IMPACT EVALUATION | PERFORMANCE EVALUATION | STRATEGY, PERFORMANCE & CAPACITY BUILDING

**This page is intentionally left blank**

# Evaluating the Effectiveness of Regional Migration Program Models on Providing Assistance to Vulnerable Migrants

## FINAL REPORT

July 28, 2017



PREPARED BY

Steven Zyck  
Loretta Peschi

### DISCLAIMER

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Department of State or the United States Government.

# Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>1. Introduction and Background .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1. Evaluation Purpose and Questions .....	1
1.2. Evaluation Methodology .....	2
1.3. Evaluation Constraints and Limitations .....	4
1.4. Structure of the Report.....	4
<b>2. The Regional Migration Program Model: What Is It, and Is It Functioning as Intended?.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. The RMP Model .....	5
2.2. The Model in Action .....	6
2.3. Implications.....	8
<b>3. To what extent are the Regional Migration Programs effective in building government capacity to humanely manage migration and address the needs of vulnerable migrants? .....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1. Knowledge .....	10
3.2. Attitudes.....	11
3.3. Practices .....	12
3.4. Reach and Sustainability.....	12
3.5. Question 1a: IOM Responsiveness to Feedback.....	14
<b>4. To what extent do the focus areas of the Regional Migration Programs indirectly or directly contribute to strategic regional responses to irregular migration and vulnerable migrants? .....</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1. Capacity Building .....	16
4.2. Direct Assistance to Vulnerable Migrants .....	17
4.3. Links to Regional Migration Dialogues .....	19
4.4. IOM-UNHCR Coordination .....	20
4.5. Emergency Migration Management .....	20
<b>5. Recommendations .....</b>	<b>22</b>
5.1. Overarching Recommendations.....	22
5.2. Pillar-Specific Recommendations.....	23
<b>Annex A: Inclusion of International Good Practices .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Annex B: Evaluation Methodology (from the Inception/Desk Review Report) .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Annex C: Glossary .....</b>	<b>41</b>

# Acronyms

<b>AVR</b>	Assisted Voluntary Return
<b>DoS</b>	U.S. Department of State
<b>ET</b>	Evaluation Team
<b>HQ</b>	Headquarters
<b>FY</b>	Fiscal Year
<b>HoA</b>	Horn of Africa
<b>ILO</b>	International Labor Organization
<b>IOM</b>	International Organization of Migration
<b>KIIs</b>	Key Informant Interviews
<b>LGBTI</b>	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Intersex
<b>MICIC</b>	Migration in Countries in Crisis Initiative
<b>MCOF</b>	Migration in Crises Operational Framework
<b>PRM</b>	Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (US Department of State)
<b>RCM</b>	Regional Conference on Migration
<b>RCMM</b>	Regional Committee on Mixed Migration
<b>RCPs</b>	Regional Consultative Processes
<b>RMPs</b>	Regional Migration Programs
<b>SGBV</b>	Sexual and Gender-Based Violence
<b>SI</b>	Social Impact
<b>SOW</b>	Statement of Work
<b>TIP</b>	Trafficking in Persons
<b>ToT</b>	Training of Trainers
<b>UAMC</b>	Unaccompanied Migrant Children
<b>UNHCR</b>	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children's Fund
<b>UN WOMEN</b>	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

# Acknowledgements

Numerous people helped to commission and shepherd this evaluation. These include Maria Rowan and a number of colleagues from the US Department of State Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (DoS/PRM) and several individuals from the International Organization for Migration's (IOM) around the world.

Furthermore, the Evaluation Team goes well beyond the authors of this report and includes individuals from Social Impact's Headquarters (HQ) management team composed of Program Manager Catherine Villada, Program Director Erica Holzaepfel, and Program Assistant Kate Seibold.

Lastly, the Evaluation Team would like to acknowledge the wide range of people who gave their time, thoughts, and efforts to make this evaluation come to fruition. While such individuals are not named here in the interest of confidentiality and anonymity, they include representatives of governments, regional organizations, and international, national, and local aid and civil society organizations – as well as vulnerable migrants and returnees themselves – across East Africa, Yemen, and Central America.

# Executive Summary

This evaluation examined the performance of the Regional Migration Programs (RMPs) in the Horn of Africa and Yemen (HoA) and Mesoamerica, implemented by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) during Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 and FY 2016. The HoA program is managed via Kenya and is being implemented in Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somaliland, Puntland, and Yemen; it has a combined FY 2015 and 2016 budget of \$3,300,000. The Mesoamerica Program is managed via Costa Rica and is being implemented in Costa Rica as well as El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Panama; it has a combined FY 2015 and 2016 budget of \$4,465,000.

The purpose of this evaluation is to identify program strengths and areas for improvement and to capture best practices, lessons learned, and actionable recommendations to inform the regional migration management programming of the US Department of State Bureau for Population, Refugees, and Migration (DoS/PRM) and IOM. This evaluation seeks to inform the following evaluation questions:

1. To what extent are the Regional Migration Programs effective in building government capacity to humanely manage migration and address the needs of vulnerable migrants?
  - a. To what extent is IOM responsive to feedback provided by beneficiaries including government partners and migrants?
2. To what extent do the focus areas of the Regional Migration Programs indirectly or directly contribute to strategic regional responses to irregular migration and vulnerable migrants?
  - a. Capacity building
  - b. Direct assistance to vulnerable migrants
  - c. Links to regional migration dialogues
  - d. IOM-UNHCR coordination
  - e. Emergency migration management

This evaluation applied a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, including review of project documents and literature and primary data collection in Kenya, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Mexico. The field-level data collection involved a range of methods, including interviews with 287 different individuals. Finally, the ET conducted an online survey of IOM staff; which was completed by more than 50 staff members across the two regions/programs included in this evaluation.

## THE DOS/PRM REGIONAL MIGRATION MANAGEMENT MODEL

DoS/PRM is supporting 10 RMPs around the world. Each differs but is built around a core model that includes five pillars, the final of which was added in FY 2016-17. These pillars include: (i) capacity building, (ii) direct assistance to vulnerable migrants, (iii) links to regional migration dialogues, (iv) IOM-UNHCR coordination, and, since FY 2016, (v) emergency migration management (EMM). These five pillars are intended to operate together around the primary objective of building sustainable government capacity to manage migration and protect vulnerable migrants.



This five-pillar model is being implemented in different ways in the two regions included in this evaluation. In Mesoamerica, the program was largely functioning as intended, with a primary focus on capacity building and a majority of staff time being dedicated to trainings, workshops, and otherwise supporting local and national authorities. In contrast, capacity building was a very minor program component of the HoA program and was surpassed by direct assistance. IOM provided training to 577 people, generally ranging in time from a half day to two days, in the HoA in FY 2015 as opposed to more than 3,000 in Mesoamerica – where trainings were often much longer and ranged from one day to three months. In contrast, the HoA program provided more direct assistance, including Assisted Voluntary Return (AVR) services to nearly 10,000 migrants in FY 2015.

Overall the evaluation finds that the five-pillar model is appropriate, even if its multiple components at times lead IOM to spread itself too thinly rather than focusing primarily on capacity building. Likewise, IOM has, particularly in the HoA program, sought to reinterpret the program model to coincide with their own priorities and gaps in funding (i.e., for direct assistance), and DoS/PRM has not monitored and pushed back against this tendency in the past. The model has, to some extent, been set aside as particular program designs and activities have taken on a momentum of their own.

## FINDINGS

### ***Q1: Effectiveness of Capacity Building Activities***

IOM has contributed to improvements in knowledge among participants. In both the HoA and Mesoamerica regions, the majority of subnational government officials interviewed by the ET noted that they were not aware of basic concepts such as migration, irregular and mixed migration, vulnerability, and the like before IOM trainings; this was particularly evident in the HoA program, where officials were commonly approaching migration with relatively little background knowledge.

The programs have also contributed to attitudinal changes surrounding migration among training participants. Whereas officials had previously believed that migrants were economically motivated or were criminal trespassers, the programs helped them to understand that migrants are often driven to migrate by intolerable conditions in their home countries and communities and that they are often highly vulnerable.

Capacity building activities have had a relatively small impact on skills and tangible practices in both of the regions included in this evaluation. Fewer than 10% of training recipients interviewed by the ET could specify exactly what skills they had gained from IOM trainings and workshops. In the majority of cases, governmental and civil society interviewees expressed their regret that IOM had not provided training on practical skills such as: migrant screening, management of migration centers, psychosocial assistance, and responding to survivors of trafficking and sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV). While interviewees felt that such topics could not have easily been integrated into the initial training they received – which included a discussion of key migration concepts and trends – a majority of interviewees had hoped that these skills would have been addressed in follow-on trainings. Such trainings rarely materialized, with most capacity building participants receiving one-off trainings rather than any systematic training over an extended period of time.



### ***Q1a: Responsiveness to Feedback***

IOM has been responsive to government partners, most notably with regards to the targeting, content, duration, and format of capacity building activities. More than 90% of government respondents in both the HoA and Mesoamerica noted that IOM had been responsive to feedback concerning program activities. IOM had been similarly responsive to feedback provided by Regional Consultative Processes (RCPs) in both regions visited by the ET. In the context of the Regional Committee on Mixed Migration (RCMM) in East Africa, IOM has been responsive to the suggestions of member states' representatives, who generally set the agenda with IOM input. Likewise, in Mesoamerica, IOM has functioned as the implementing arm of the Regional Conference on Migration (RCM) – organizing workshops, forums, training, and written materials (e.g., guidelines and manuals) at the request of this regional body.

However, IOM has not systematically engaged with migrants in order to get their feedback on a widespread basis. In the HoA program, despite IOM's large-scale provision of direct assistance to migrants, there were only a small number of instances where IOM had systematically collected feedback from beneficiaries. In most cases, this feedback was optional and provided face-to-face with those providing assistance rather than in an anonymized manner.

### ***Q2: Contribution to a Strategic Regional Response***

**Capacity Building:** IOM has introduced some engaging and relatively innovative components. These are particularly evident in the Mesoamerica program, where IOM has introduced e-learning opportunities with self-guided as well as tutored options. In the HoA program, IOM has also recently introduced peer-learning approaches among youth. However, IOM has not engaged in structured assessments of capacity needs and factors that would enable or undermine improved responses to vulnerable migrants. Such assessments would, for instance, not only help to identify what information and skills officials and civil society figures require but would also question whether the primary challenge is, in fact, individual capacities as opposed to financial or institutional factors.

Most importantly, training participants noted that they often received one-off trainings rather than a more structured capacity building process that would allow them to build expertise. More than two-thirds of past capacity building participants included in this evaluation expressed a desire for further training to allow them to develop more advanced skills.

**Direct Assistance:** The most effective and widely lauded forms of IOM direct assistance have generally come in response to acute migration-related emergencies. These have included the large-scale return of migrants from Yemen to the Horn of Africa and the sudden arrival of large numbers of Cuban and Haitian migrants into Central America. IOM has performed strongly in these cases – provide appropriate forms of assistance in a timely manner – according to government officials which IOM supported in both regions. AVR is another area where IOM's direct assistance was praised by interviewees as well as by IOM staff – most of whom rated it as highly effective or effective in IOM staff surveys conducted in both regions

However, there are areas where IOM's direct assistance did demonstrate major challenges. First, some of the physical infrastructure investments that IOM has supported have not been

widely utilized. These include Migration Resource Centers (MRCs) in the HoA program and Information Windows/Hubs in the Mesoamerica program. These physical pieces of migration infrastructure were being under-utilized due to a combination of limited marketing/communications, sub-optimal locations/placement, and changes in migration patterns. However, in both regions, IOM had not adequately analyzed these factors or developed strategies to increase the number of migrants taking advantage of MRCs or Information Hubs. Second, the ET found that in the HoA, MRCs were not being consistently monitored or effectively managed by IOM, as detailed in the regional summary report for the HoA program. Last, IOM has yet to identify a strong means of linking direct assistance with capacity building in a comprehensive manner.

**Links to Regional Migration Dialogues:** The programs have strengthened regional migration forums in both regions that the ET examined and has helped to inform their discussions and turn these discussions into tangible plans and actions. However, IOM has not been able to overcome the tendency for these regional consultative processes (RCPs) to primarily serve as discussion forums that only rarely lead to improved regional cooperation or harmonization of approaches to migration and vulnerability. The non-binding nature of these dialogues is crucial to ensuring many governments' participation and openness to the process, though it also means that participating governments feel relatively little pressure to make changes in accordance with the many recommendations that these RCPs generate.

**IOM-UNHCR Coordination:** IOM has coordinated consistently with UNHCR and other relevant UN agencies and has involved UNHCR and others in its program activities where relevant. Coordination as well as cooperation between IOM and UNHCR is strong, and referrals are operating smoothly and non-competitively between the organizations across all of the regions and countries the ET visited. There is no sense of competition over beneficiaries or over relationships with government stakeholders.

IOM has also engaged effectively with other relevant UN agencies (and other international actors), including UNICEF, International Labor Organization (ILO), UN-WOMEN, UNDP, and the ICRC. These actors share information, participate in one another's events, and brainstorm ideas for future multi-agency programs. In Mesoamerica, IOM and these other agencies, as well as the Red Cross Movement, are engaging in shelter monitoring together, and IOM and UNHCR have shared staff members and premises in Costa Rica and Mexico. In the HoA, IOM and UNICEF are collaborating closely in a number of areas, including on the Transit Center that processes returnee children who are coming home to Ethiopia from abroad.

**Emergency Migration Management:** IOM has made some initial progress on the EMM pillar, which was added to the program at the encouragement of DoS/PRM in FY 2016. However, given that this progress has been relatively limited – one regional workshop in Mesoamerica and no events during the evaluation in the HoA – the ET is hesitant to offer any more than a few observations. First, there seems to be a degree of trepidation about this program component among both IOM staff members – outside of regional management hubs (i.e., Nairobi and San Jose) – and government officials. Second, in Mesoamerica, interviewees familiar with the Migration in Countries in Crisis (MICIC) workshop felt that it was engaging and beneficial but that it would have the greatest impact if it was linked with emergency preparedness activities. These should, according to respondents, particularly include contingency planning among local, subnational, and national government

institutions, among migrant shelters, among civil society organizations, and among embassies and consulates.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The full report provides a series of overarching and pillar-specific recommendations. The following, however, are the recommendations that the ET perceives as being the most strategic and important.

- **Simplify and focus the activities within each RMP, focusing only on those deemed likely to build lasting government capacity, particularly on the so-called frontlines.** IOM will need to move away from its current activities and embrace a far more targeted approach rooted in capacity building both through trainings as well as through IOM-government collaboration in direct assistance and emergency response. This will require radical changes to programs in places such as the HoA, where programs focus to a very limited extent on capacity building.
- **Introduce systematic approaches to monitoring and evaluation of capacity building activities as well as on the other components of the RMPs.** This will involve training of IOM staff on data collection and dedicating adequate resources and staff time not only to monitoring trainings and activities as they happen – but also to monitoring their results three or six months following delivery.
- **Articulate a capacity building strategy reflecting a medium-to-long-term vision with graduated steps for participating officials.** There is a real chance for the RMPs to avoid one-off trainings and instead provide a multi-session capacity building strategy for participants. This should involve increasingly complex content and skills-building as well as practical elements that link with participants' day-to-day work.
- **Broaden partnerships for capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, institutional learning, and more.** For instance, IOM should more closely involve universities and civil and security service training academies in the capacity building process. Issues related to migration and vulnerability should be integrated into these institutions' standard curriculums for police and border officials, teachers, medical professionals, and others in regions with high numbers of migrants. Partnerships with universities can further enable IOM to learn what capacity building approaches are and are not working effectively – thus freeing up IOM from some of these data collection and research responsibilities.
- **Design and implement a handover strategy.** In order to help IOM and partner governments understand that these programs are intended to build capacities and ultimately be phased out, IOM should develop handover strategies with a timeline suited to each region. These strategies will help to ensure that governments and IOM think about how to pursue capacity building in the most effective and timely manner possible.

Beyond the recommendations above, IOM should begin a process of considering – in each region that is home to a DoS/PRM-funded regional migration program – what the findings of this evaluation mean for their work.

# 1. Introduction and Background

## Section Summary:

- This evaluation used mixed methods to evaluate the Regional Migration Programs (RMPs) implemented by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) in Mesoamerica and the Horn of Africa and Yemen.
- The evaluation included a document review, examination of IOM's quantitative monitoring data (where available), online surveys, and qualitative data from nearly 300 interviews with stakeholders across Central America and East Africa, including in Costa Rica, Guatemala, Mexico, Djibouti, Ethiopia, and Kenya.

## 1.1. Evaluation Purpose and Questions

This evaluation examined the performance of the Regional Migration Programs (RMPs) in the Horn of Africa and Yemen (hereafter HoA) and Mesoamerica implemented by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) during Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 and FY 2016. The HoA program is managed via Kenya and is being implemented in Djibouti, Ethiopia, Somaliland, Puntland, and Yemen; it has a combined FY 2015 and 2016 budget of \$3,300,000.<sup>1</sup> The Mesoamerica program is managed via Costa Rica and implemented in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and Panama; it has a combined FY 2015 and 2016 budget of \$4,465,000.<sup>2</sup>

**The purpose of this evaluation is to identify program strengths and areas for improvement and to capture best practices, lessons learned, and actionable recommendations to inform the RMPs supported by the US Department of State Bureau for Population, Refugees, and Migration (DoS/PRM) and implemented by IOM.** The end users of the evaluation are personnel within DoS/PRM, particularly its Migration Office, and within IOM at the global, regional, and national levels. Given that DoS/PRM is supporting 10 RMPs with IOM around the world, the goal is for the findings of this evaluation to go beyond HoA and Mesoamerica and to feed more broadly into the development of RMPs in other regions. This process will be aided not only by this report but also by the accompanying set of tools which the evaluation team (ET) has developed for program monitoring, proposal assessment, and more (see Annex C).

The evaluation seeks to inform the following evaluation questions established by DoS/PRM in the Statement of Work (SOW):

1. To what extent are the Regional Migration Programs effective in building government capacity to humanely manage migration and address the needs of vulnerable migrants?
  - a. To what extent is IOM responsive to feedback provided by beneficiaries including government partners and migrants?

---

<sup>1</sup> This includes \$1,500,000 for FY 2015 and \$1,800,000 for FY 2016.

<sup>2</sup> This includes \$2,015,000 for FY 2015 and \$2,450,000 for FY 2016; note that the FY 2015 amount includes a carryover of \$239,894 from FY 2014.

2. To what extent do the focus areas of the Regional Migration Programs indirectly or directly contribute to strategic regional responses to irregular migration and vulnerable migrants?
  - a. Capacity building
  - b. Direct assistance to vulnerable migrants
  - c. Links to regional migration dialogues
  - d. IOM-UNHCR coordination
  - e. Emergency migration management

The report also addresses a number of issues requested by DoS/PRM in the evaluation SOW and in subsequent conversations: (i) the relevance and appropriateness of the PRM-IOM approach to RMPs and its five pillars; (ii) whether PRM-supported programs were designed and implemented using good practices applicable to successful migration programs; (iii) any issues of concern that occurred as a result of the capacity building programs; and (vi) whether and how DoS/PRM should refine the Regional Migration Program Model in the future.

## 1.2. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation began with a structured literature and document review that enabled the ET to better understand the programs in question and to engage in a degree of benchmarking (i.e., identifying good practices from the research to assess their presence in IOM's Mesoamerica program). **The subsequent, field-based portion of the evaluation included primary data collection in several locations across Ethiopia, Djibouti, and Kenya in January-February 2017 and in Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Mexico in April-May 2017.** These countries were selected for primary data collection given that they contain the programs' management hubs (Kenya and Costa Rica) and given that these countries are home to relatively high levels of program activity.

Across these locations, the ET applied the data collection methods described below. These methods were informed by an Internal Review Board (IRB) process that weighed the ethical considerations that needed to be applied in dealing with vulnerable populations and in managing sensitive information gathered from migrants, civil society, government officials, and others.

- **Key-informant interviews (KIIs)** were conducted with IOM personnel, national and subnational government representatives, representatives of other relevant agencies (e.g., UNICEF and UNCHR), civil society personnel, and donor focal points.
- **Beneficiary interviews** were conducted with migrants. In several instances migrants and returnees were interviewed individually, though a small number of group interviews were also conducted. The majority of these interviews were carried out in the HoA, where IOM is directly assisting large numbers of migrants.
- **An online survey** was used to capture information from IOM staff members across the two regions. The survey instrument itself was slightly modified between the two regions to account for differences in the programs.
- **Secondary data analysis** was also applied in the relatively limited instances where monitoring or performance data regarding the program was available. This was

particularly the case in Mesoamerica, where IOM had been regularly collecting monitoring data on its capacity building activities.

The sampling process was purposive with regards to key informants. The ET sought to interview a large number of individuals familiar with the program and related work on migration management. Given the relatively transient nature of the beneficiary population, an opportunistic sampling approach was adopted for migrant interviews. **All individual and group interviews and surveys were preceded by an informed consent discussion** that reviewed with respondents the ways in which their information would be used and how their identities would be protected throughout the course of the evaluation and in the evaluation report; respondents were given the choice to not participate in the interviews and were told they could end the interview at any time or decline to answer particular questions.

*Table 1: Breakdown of Interview Respondents by Type (n=287)*

Type of respondent	Horn of Africa and Yemen Regional Evaluation Respondents (n 156)	Mesoamerica Regional Evaluation Respondents (n 131)
Female	27.3%	46.7%
Male	72.7%	43.3%
National/regional staff	33.7%	78.3%
International staff	19.2%	5.8%
Regional (incl. migrants out of own country)	47.1%	15.8%
IOM staff	20.9%	18.3%
National government	7.6%	20.5%
Subnational or local government	14.5%	20.3%
Other UN or NGO	7.0%	28.3%
Beneficiary/migrant/returnee	47.1%	5.8%
Other/donor/academic	2.9%	5.0%
<b>Breakdown of migrant/beneficiary respondents</b>		
Adult female	18.5%	-
Adult male	72.8%	-
Unaccompanied children	8.6%	100%

Data were analyzed in a variety of ways. Secondary and survey data were subjected to basic forms of quantitative analysis to identify the frequency of certain responses and to look for any major differences in responses between countries. In the case of KII and beneficiary interview data, the ET coded entries according to the relevant country, evaluation question, and theme and examined the frequency of different messages and themes shared by respondents. A more structured method of comparing interview data was considered but ultimately rejected given that each respondent had very different levels of awareness of the IOM programs (e.g., with one activity or with activities only in one narrow area) and could not

offer highly comparable pieces of information on diverse programs across more than six countries.

### **1.3. Evaluation Constraints and Limitations**

The ET ultimately conducted interviews with nearly 300 individuals across six countries – eight if one includes the United States and remote interviews with stakeholders in Geneva and elsewhere. However, a small number of constraints merit notation. First, the evaluation was able to draw upon IOM monitoring data to a lesser extent than envisioned at the planning phase. Weaknesses in IOM monitoring systems, which are recognized by IOM staff, meant that consistent and sound data on the outcomes or impact of capacity building and direct assistance was missing in a number of cases. In other instances in the HoA program, even basic output-level data was not always being consistently and accurately documented, according to IOM staff. As a result of these sorts of challenges, the ET could not draw upon secondary data too widely. This meant that the ET opted to adopt a more qualitative approach grounded in key informant and beneficiary interviews, to informing the evaluation questions.

Second, some online surveys conducted as part of this evaluation received far fewer responses than was desired, particularly in the HoA. Less than a third of IOM program staff in that region responded to an online survey created for this evaluation, and almost no members of the Regional Committee on Mixed Migration (RCMM) responded to an online survey related to this evaluation. Both surveys were disseminated by IOM staff in the region and included repeated references to the anonymity and confidentiality of responses, though the response rates remained low.

### **1.4. Structure of the Report**

Beginning in Section 2, the report provides a brief overview of the DoS/PRM-IOM RMP model and its five pillars and discusses the extent to which this model is relevant and appropriate. Section 3 then tackles the effectiveness of capacity building efforts while Section 4 turns to the regional strategy and the underlying five pillars (capacity building, direct assistance, regional migration dialogue, IOM-UNHCR cooperation, and emergency migration management). The final two sections provide a series of good practices, lessons learned, and recommendations for DoS/PRM and IOM.



## 2. The Regional Migration Program Model: What Is It, and Is It Functioning as Intended?

### Section Summary:

- The RMP model and its five pillars aim to build local stakeholder capacities to manage migration and protect vulnerable migrants.
- This model is being interpreted in widely different ways in the two regions that the ET covered. While it is being largely implemented as intended in Mesoamerica, it has generally been set aside by IOM in the HoA, where direct assistance has far exceeded capacity building as the program's main focus.
- The model's five pillars pose a challenge when combined with the fact that RMPs have relatively limited resources which are further spread across numerous countries in any given region. This leads to a situation in which IOM is stretched thin and leads to a dilution of its focus and impact.

### 2.1. The RMP Model

DoS/PRM is supporting 10 RMPs around the world. Each differs but is built around a core model that includes five pillars, the final of which was added in FY 2016-17. These pillars are briefly summarized below.



**Capacity Building:** An emphasis on building the capacity of host governments to better manage international migration. Capacity-building is the most important component and the foundation for other program components.



**Direct Assistance to Vulnerable Migrants:** Direct assistance components should be as closely linked to the program's capacity building activities as possible. A direct connection between capacity building and direct assistance helps the people being trained to get the most out of capacity building – to understand why it is important and to see tangible results, while helping the most vulnerable.



**Links to Regional Migration Dialogues:** Where regions have migration dialogues or “regional consultative processes” (RCPs), the programs attempt to link to these (as has happened in the Horn of Africa and Mesoamerica).



**IOM-UNHCR Coordination:** Each regional program includes some degree of coordination between IOM and UNHCR, particularly in regions where there are mixed flows of refugees and other migrants, including mechanisms for cross-referrals (asylum-seekers and stateless persons to UNHCR, and Trafficking in Persons (TIP) victims or other non-refugee vulnerable migrants to IOM), so that migrants in need do not fall through

the cracks.



**Emergency Migration Management:** This pillar, added for FY 2016, increases government capacity to anticipate migration crises and better respond to migration flows through development of planning and response tools for humane responses to

The RMPs reflect the fact that many governments require improved capacities to manage irregular migration and to protect vulnerable migrants. To bolster these capacities, the RMP model includes direct capacity building activities such as trainings as well as a degree of on-the-job training in which they observe and learn from IOM's direct assistance to the most vulnerable migrants. Other program components, including regional dialogues, also aim to help officials share information and experiences across countries and to agree upon harmonized approaches to sharing data and managing migration. These processes would also be bolstered by improved coordination between IOM and the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR) – and these near-term processes would be guided by longer-term thinking about managing future migration emergencies.

## 2.2. The Model in Action

This five-pillar model is being implemented in different ways in the two regions included in this evaluation. In Mesoamerica, the program was largely functioning as intended, with a primary focus on capacity building and a majority of staff time being dedicated to trainings, workshops, and otherwise supporting local and national authorities. Regional migration activities, including IOM's support to the Regional Conference on Migration (RCM) and to cross-border meetings, also included a major focus on direct capacity building and networking. The newly introduced EMM pillar also appeared, despite being at the earliest stages of implementation, to fit neatly into the overall capacity building agenda. That said, direct assistance was not necessarily closely linked with capacity building, though in several cases it supplemented the capacities of local institutions.

In contrast, in the HoA program, capacity building was a very minor program component, and IOM staff interviewed by the ET were often surprised to learn that the program was principally intended to build governmental as well as civil society capacities. Instead, the HoA program – in light of massive migrant flows and returns to and from the HoA, and a degree of instability in parts of Ethiopia – focused on direct assistance to vulnerable migrants through assisted voluntary return (AVR) activities, the establishment of Migration Resource Centers (MRCs), and other activities. Since the middle of FY 2016 IOM had worked more to include government officials in the operations of direct assistance, particularly the MRCs, but had not necessarily focused on larger-scale capacity building activities outside of a handful of workshops and trainings. Regional engagement through the Regional Committee on Mixed Migration (RCMM) was building capacities as well, though this was primarily limited to the relatively narrow élan of officials who participated in this regional forum and the preparatory and follow-up meetings.

Table 2: Selected Program Spending Statistics, FY 201

Cost /Activity	HoA Program (FY 2015 and 2016)	% of HoA Budget	Mesoamerica Program (FY 2015 and 2016)	% of Mesoamerica Budget
IOM Personnel	865,800	29%	1,872,864	42%
IOM Facilities	295,030	10%	245,458	5%
Capacity Building	151,000	5%	812,317	18%
Awareness Raising	205,000	7%	375,546	8%
Direct Assistance and AVR	729,000	25%	74,900	2%
MRC Support (HoA) and Shelter Support (Mesoamerica)	569,200	19%	188,855	4%
Regional Dialogue	98,413	3%	762,081	17%
Emergency Migration Mgmt	Not specified	-	96,300	2%
Monitoring and Evaluation	48,400	2%	36,680	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,961,843</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>4,465,001</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Provided by IOM regional program managers/coordinators at the request of the ET. Note that not all percentage columns will necessarily add up to 100% given rounding.

Program spending demonstrates the different emphases of the two RMPs included in this evaluation. While the Mesoamerica program includes 18% of its resources for capacity building, this is only 5% in the HoA program. Conversely, the HoA program includes 44% of the budget for direct assistance (including AVR) and MRCs while the total spending related to direct assistance and shelter support in Mesoamerica is only around 6%.

These differences in spending also produce very different outcomes. IOM provided training to 577 people, generally over the course of a half day or one or two days, in the HoA in FY 2015 as opposed to more than 3,000 in Mesoamerica – where trainings were often much longer and ranged from one day to three months. To contrast, the HoA program provided AVR services to nearly 10,000 migrants in FY 2015 while the Mesoamerica program did the same for only 15 migrants that same year.

**Box 1: Selected Program Outputs***Selected Training/Capacity Building Figures in Mesoamerica, FY 2015*

Country	Trainings on migrant protection and assistance	Participants migrant protection and assistance trainings	Participants in psychosocial assistance	Participants in assistance to UACs
Costa Rica	10	264	23	-
El Salvador	16	514	21	108
Guatemala	16	482	44	103
Honduras	14	316	31	85
Mexico	16	727	39	102
Panama	7	158	25	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>2,461</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>398</b>
IOM Target	72	None specified	270	400

*Direct Assistance in the Horn of Africa, Selected Statistics, FY 2015*

Location	Migrants provided with medical referral and assistance by MRC and IOM	Non food item distribution to migrants	Assisted voluntary return completed by MRC and IOM <sup>1</sup>
<i>Hargeisa</i>	1,916	64	240
<i>Bosasso</i>	113	0	0
<i>Djibouti</i>	0	1,603	1,065
<i>Yemen</i>	7,468	2,782	1,978
<i>Ethiopia</i>	0	1,545	1,834
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,497</b>	<b>5,994</b>	<b>5,117</b>

**2.3. Implications**

This sub-section considers the implications of the variations in the RMPs that the ET identified during its work. Are the differences noted above a reflection of problems facing the RMP model? Are the differences between the HoA and Mesoamerica programs an example of necessary adjustments to ensure that the RMP model is contextually-appropriate? These questions are addressed here but should also be examined and considered by IOM and DoS/PRM in the coming months.

The ET finds that the overall challenge is not primarily with the RMP model. The model provides for a multi-pronged approach to building capacity and strengthening regional cooperation on irregular migration. The primary challenge is a management one. IOM has, particularly in the case of the HoA program, sought to use the DoS/PRM funding not to implement a capacity building program, but rather to fill gaps in terms of direct assistance activities. DoS/PRM has, for its part, not necessarily pushed back strongly enough against this trend and ensured that the resources are genuinely being spent in a manner that bolsters local capacities.

Two other points merit discussion. First, based on the evaluation in the HoA and Mesoamerica, IOM and DoS/PRM have not yet developed ways of linking direct assistance with capacity building. Direct assistance activities, with minor exceptions, tend to operate independently of capacity building agendas rather than serving as a form of on-the-job training in which IOM staff model good practices for local officials and civil society. The recent introduction of the EMM pillar may provide an opportunity to overcome this challenge and to use IOM's responses to migration crises as a way of training and mentoring local officials who are overwhelmed when these situations strike.

Second, the overall breadth of the model and its five pillars may pose some added challenges for IOM as it attempts to determine how to balance its emphasis between the various components and activities. The presence of so many different pillars means that it is harder for DoS/PRM to understand the real field-level emphasis that IOM is placing on the different pillars; and it also means that IOM may spread itself too thin across all five pillars rather than truly focusing on building long-term capacities. This leads to a tendency for these RMPs to be broad but shallow – meaning the programs are composed of numerous activities and are not necessarily able to achieve a deep, lasting impact in any one area.

### 3. To What Extent Are the Regional Migration Programs Effective in Building Government Capacity to Humanely Manage Migration and Address the Needs of Vulnerable Migrants?<sup>3</sup>

#### Section Summary:

- The RMPs have led to increases in government officials' and others' knowledge of migration and vulnerability and in their attitudes towards migrants. They now understand the diverse drivers of migration and the challenges that migrants face and are, thus, more likely to view them as a group in need of protection rather than as criminals.
- IOM's programming has had little impact on officials' skills to manage migration and address the needs of vulnerable migrants. Participants in IOM trainings and workshops frequently requested additional training that would allow them to develop skills related to migrant screening and assistance to victims of sexual violence.
- The RMPs can also do more to achieve a wider reach by improving training of trainers approaches and e learning as well as by integrating IOM capacity building content into national civil service and border agency training institutions.

As noted in the methodological limitations section, IOM has not consistently collected data on the impact of its trainings. Pre- and post-training survey data has been collected in a large number of instances in Mesoamerica — and only very rarely in the HoA program — but this data often relies on participants' self-assessments of changes in knowledge and skills rather than on more credible methods such as testing and measuring the application of knowledge and skills. Hence, this evaluation faced certain limitations in assessing the overall effectiveness of capacity building during the relatively short periods of field work, and much of what follows is primarily based on participants' own descriptions of information and skills that they gained (or wish they had gained) as a result of IOM capacity building activities. Furthermore, the ET examined a related element of effectiveness – reach (see Section 3.4). That is, did IOM leverage all opportunities to reach the greatest number of capacity building beneficiaries in the countries and regions in question?

#### 3.1. Knowledge

IOM has contributed to improvements in knowledge among participants. In both the HoA and Mesoamerica, the majority of subnational government officials interviewed by the ET noted that they were not aware of basic concepts such as migration, irregular and mixed migration, vulnerability, and the like before IOM trainings; this was particularly evident in the HoA program, where officials were commonly approaching migration with relatively little background knowledge. Likewise, beneficiaries of IOM capacity building activities at the

---

<sup>3</sup> This report addresses FY 2015 and FY 2016. However, it is also important to note the program's significant contribution to the development of anti-trafficking laws across the region during the FY 2011 – FY 2014 time period.

national level repeatedly noted that they learned about vulnerability and international legal frameworks pertaining to refugees and migrants through the IOM workshops and trainings. The same applies to members of Regional Consultative Processes (RCPs) such as the RCMM in East Africa and the RCM in Mesoamerica, which generally help participants to gain information regarding migration and particular issues such as the needs of unaccompanied minor migrants. Only three beneficiaries of IOM capacity building activities – out of the several hundred interviewed – felt that they had not gained new knowledge from the trainings. Those individuals were generally subject-matter specialists in particular issues (e.g., migration and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Intersex (LGBTI) community) and felt that IOM trainings provided refresher information but not necessarily new content.

To bring some data to bear on this issue, participants in a youth training held under FY 2015 in Costa Rica noted improvements (as well as some declines) in their knowledge in many domains as a result of IOM training (Table 3).

*Table 3: Results of the Youth Training, Costa Rica<sup>4</sup>*

Topic	Average Score (Pre Test) (n 21)	Average Score (Post Test) (n 15)
General concepts	71.4%	66.7%
Youth migration push/pull factors	89.2%	87.9%
Young migrants' rights	82.1%	93.3%
Migrant categories	84.1%	91.1%
Interview process	74.6%	68.9%
Risks and vulnerabilities	79.4%	91.1%

Little data is available, however, to determine whether training participants have retained the information that they gained during trainings and workshops offered under this program. However, particularly in Mesoamerica, training participants receive tailored materials that will enable them to refer back to training lessons in the subsequent months and years.

### **3.2. Attitudes**

As detailed in the regional summary reports for the HoA and Mesoamerica programs, the programs have contributed to attitudinal changes surrounding migration among training participants. Whereas officials had previously believed that migrants were economically motivated or were criminal trespassers, the programs helped them to understand that migrants are often driven by intolerable conditions in their home countries and communities and that they are often highly vulnerable.

This focus on attitudes is congruent with international best practices which the ET documented in the desk review conducted for this evaluation. That desk review stated: "Attitudes among officials often require as much attention as knowledge and skills when it comes to more humanely managing migration [...] For instance, border officials often perceive trafficking as a law-enforcement rather than protection issue or may not object to

<sup>4</sup> Migration and youth training workshop, with an emphasis on young migrants' specific protection and assistance needs, for 25 young people (12-28 years; 12M/13W) from religious and CSOs delivered from June 11-12, 2016.



trafficking on historical or cultural grounds [...] Hence, migration management programs must prioritize long-term attitudinal change.”

Attitudinal change often occurred rather organically in the HoA program as IOM collaborated with national and local government stakeholders in assisting migrants. In Mesoamerica, IOM had a carefully crafted approach to changing attitudes that included documentaries and other materials to help training participants understand the diverse drivers of migration and the stories of vulnerable migrants. In both regions, public information activities helped the local populations – as well as officials – to further understand the conditions that forced migrants to flee and the challenges they encountered along their journeys.

### **3.3. Practices**

Capacity building activities have had a lesser impact on skills and tangible practices in both of the regions included in this evaluation. Fewer than 10% of training recipients interviewed by the ET could specify exactly what skills they had gained from IOM trainings and workshops. IOM had most notably built skills related to vulnerability screening in the HoA program – but not to nearly the same extent in the Mesoamerica program.

In the majority of cases, governmental and civil society interviewees expressed their regret that IOM had not provided training on practical skills, such as: migrant screening, management of migration centers, psychosocial assistance, and responding to survivors of trafficking and sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV). While interviewees felt that such topics could not have easily been integrated into the initial training they received – which included a discussion of key migration concepts and trends – a majority of interviewees had hoped that skills would have been addressed in follow-on trainings. Such trainings rarely materialized, with most capacity building participants receiving one-off trainings rather than any systematic training over an extended period of time.

While IOM's capacity building did not specifically focus on skills in most instances, interviewees in Mesoamerica and the HoA did report some instances in which the attitudinal changes noted above had contributed to better protection for migrants. According to one IOM staff member quoted in the HoA regional summary report: “Two or three years ago, we saw a lot more instances where border authorities rounded up migrants and dropped them off at the border. Now they either don't do this, or in a few cases they call IOM and ask if we could lend a hand.” A similar trend was found in Mesoamerica. In Mexico, for instance, border/migration officials noted that they could tell which border officers had and had not received IOM training. Those that had received IOM training reportedly engaged less aggressively and more empathetically with migrants. The ET could not verify whether IOM-trained individuals were engaging differently with migrants, though such observations were noted by interviewees in a small number of instances.

### **3.4. Reach and Sustainability**

Beyond knowledge, attitudes, and practices, the ET also considered whether capacity building activities had achieved the greatest possible reach -- in terms of beneficiary numbers – and whether they were moving towards sustainability.

With regards to reach, the evaluation found that there is room for improvement in both regions examined though particularly in the HoA program. With regards to that program, the

regional summary report stated: “That said, IOM has not necessarily taken logical steps to maximize the impact of its capacity building activities – in light of the resource constraints – by using a training-of-trainers approach on a large scale, by building e-learning platforms, or by creating easy-to-use training materials in local languages that governments (and others) could easily integrate into their civil service and police academies or into their onboarding for new hires.” These gaps meant that IOM was only able to reach a relatively small number of individuals through trainings provided almost exclusively by IOM staff. As a result, the program in the HoA was able to reach fewer than 600 participants, most of whom received one-day trainings or workshops.

In Mesoamerica, the situation was somewhat better. A ToT approach had been adopted as the default approach, and this had resulted in some notable gains. In Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Mexico, the ToT approach had functioned as intended, and trained government officials had replicated to colleagues the trainings they received from IOM. Furthermore, in Mesoamerica, e-learning was being used. These promising elements – ToT and e-learning – were not functioning at an optimal level. Many trained trainers (i.e., those who had undergone a ToT course) indicated that they lacked the time or institutional authorization to provide instruction to their colleagues or others. E-learning meanwhile had not yet reached its full potential given limited marketing of the self-guided course and given content that was static rather than growing. Despite these challenges, the Mesoamerica program has the capacity to greatly scale up the reach of its capacity building activities while the means of doing so do not yet exist in the HoA program.

Many of the same steps required to achieve a greater reach are also integral in terms of promoting sustainability. Most notably, IOM has not yet taken advantage of opportunities to hand over its training content and materials to national security and civil service training institutions – or to universities or technical schools – so that they might integrate them into their own courses and trainings. The only partial exception appeared to be in Costa Rica, where IOM is reportedly discussing closer collaboration with the National Police Academy in the coming months and years. Such collaborations have been held up by two main factors: (i) IOM staff’s focus on meeting programmatic training targets rather than investing in future capacity building collaborations and (ii) IOM’s concerns about losing quality control once they hand over materials to other institutions. These issues are taken up further in the recommendations section, but IOM does appear to be caught in a situation where – in order to maintain positive donor relations – it focuses on maximizing near-term outputs rather than slowing down current activities in order to focus on broader objectives and the formation of sustainable capacity building systems and networks.

#### **Box 2: Gender and Social Inclusion in IOM Capacity Building Activities**

The capacity building activities noted above have actively included women both as trainers and as participants. Women and men were both engaged actively in the capacity building activities and, from the small number of trainings that the ET observed, women were often particularly active as trainers and facilitators in smaller group discussions and exercises. Members of other vulnerable groups, including members of the LGBTI communities, had also been actively engaged in trainings, particularly within the Mesoamerica program. Other forms of social exclusion were not particularly examined in the evaluation of the capacity building activities.

### 3.5. Question 1a: IOM Responsiveness to Feedback

This particular sub-question asks: To what extent is IOM responsive to feedback provided by beneficiaries including government partners and migrants? **In short, the evaluation found that IOM is particularly responsive to feedback from government partners and regional entities and, to a lesser extent, from migrants.** However, IOM is not yet systematically gathering, storing, analyzing, and acting upon feedback, which means that input from beneficiaries may not be acted upon in all instances.

IOM has been responsive to government partners, most notably, with regards to the targeting, content, duration, and format of capacity building activities. More than 90% of government respondents in both the HoA and Mesoamerica noted that IOM had been responsive to feedback concerning program activities, and most of the remainder noted that they had not provided meaningful levels of feedback to IOM. In Ethiopia, IOM moved the MRC from Mile to Semera and re-vamped the management arrangements for the MRC as a result of feedback from officials. In Yemen and Djibouti, IOM has undertaken emergency responses to migrant/returnee/detainee issues under this program at the specific request of government officials. The same applies to Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Mexico, where government officials lauded several instances where IOM had supported government responses at their request. These include Hurricane Otto in Costa Rica, where IOM supported the relocation of migrants into shelters as the storm approached. And in both Costa Rica and Mexico, IOM supported large flows of Haitian, Cuban, and extra-continental migrants in partnership with and at the request of government counterparts. Overall, it is clear that IOM has been a solid partner with governments.

The same applies to RCPs, which IOM has run, as in the HoA program, or strongly supported, as in the Mesoamerica program. In the context of the RCMM in East Africa, IOM has been responsive to the suggestions of member states' representatives, who generally set the agenda with IOM input. Likewise, in Mesoamerica, IOM has functioned as the implementing arm of the RCM – organizing workshops, forums, training, and written materials (e.g., guidelines and manuals) at the request of this regional body.

However, IOM has not systematically engaged with migrants in order to get their feedback on a widespread basis. In the HoA program, despite IOM's large-scale provision of direct assistance to migrants, there were only a small number of instances where IOM had systematically collected feedback from beneficiaries. In most cases this feedback was optional and provided face-to-face with those providing assistance rather than in anonymized manner. In Mesoamerica IOM is less directly engaged with migrants but did not necessarily have in place systems to collect feedback from AVR beneficiaries, from those who used Information Hubs set up with program resources, or from those who benefited from shelters that the Mesoamerica program was supporting. This lack of attention to feedback stands counter to the growing emphasis on accountability to affected populations within the humanitarian and development communities and represents a lost opportunity for IOM to learn.

## 4. To What Extent Do the Focus Areas of the Regional Migration Programs Indirectly or Directly Contribute to Strategic Regional Responses to Irregular Migration and Vulnerable Migrants?

### Section Summary:

- IOM support to regional cooperation structures is exemplary in both of the regions evaluated, and IOM is gradually producing improvements in regional understandings of and approaches to migration despite major practical and political challenges.
- IOM's approach to capacity building does not reflect a number of international good practices and does not include a clear strategy rooted in high quality analysis and does tend to rely too often on one off workshops and trainings.
- Direct assistance varies widely across the two regions examined but is generally suited to the local contexts, despite room for major improvement in fixed location structures where IOM and its partners deliver assistance and provide referrals (i.e., Migration Resource Centers in HoA and Information Hubs in Mesoamerica).

The programs have contributed to strategic regional responses to varying degrees, with particular attention to regional issues in Mesoamerica and far less focus on regional responses or harmonization in the Horn of Africa and Yemen. In Mesoamerica, aided by a common language and the program's emphasis on cross-border activities, IOM has been able to promote progress on information-sharing within the region. This has, for instance, enabled countries to discuss issues such as the sudden influxes of Cuban and Haitian migrants so that countries along the transit route could better prepare for their arrival. This level of regional information-sharing has also been replicated at the local level in cross-border meetings, where officials from one country and handover difficult migrant cases seamlessly to countries on the other side of the border. This is particularly important where migrants may have protection needs.

This level of dialogue and information-sharing has not been achieved in the HoA program given the focus on direct assistance, the absence of cross-border forums, and limited regional political consensus surrounding migration data management. However, the ET does not find that this is a failure of the program. As stated in the HoA regional summary report: "A project of this size, in financial terms, has little potential to push governments to more genuinely cooperate on an issue that, according to experts, many governments in the region consider to be of relatively limited importance." That said, IOM has not yet pursued a cross-border strategy that could contribute to more localized gains. This issue is further taken up in Section 4.3.

This section now turns to each of the pillars covered by the RMPs and examines the performance of each and their contribution to improvements in regional migration management.

#### **4.1. Capacity Building**

While Section 3 of this report considered the effectiveness of the RMPs with regards to capacity building, this section discusses a small number of specific elements related to trainings, workshops, and other direct forms of capacity building. Such a discussion is somewhat challenging given the vastly different levels of attention that the HoA and Mesoamerica programs pay to capacity building. However, there are a small number of findings that apply to both.

First, IOM has introduced some engaging and relatively innovative components. These are particularly evident in the Mesoamerica program, where IOM has introduced e-learning opportunities with self-guided as well as tutored options. Respondents in Mesoamerica greatly valued these e-learning courses and were eager for further modules and courses. In addition, IOM has provided relatively long-term courses focused on issues like unaccompanied migrant children (UAMCs) in Mesoamerica. The length of these courses meant that they were able to take a more in-depth approach and contributed to participants' professional development and career advancement in rather significant ways. In the HoA program, IOM has also recently introduced peer-learning approaches among youth. The impact of these approaches has yet to be empirically studied by IOM due to the aforementioned weaknesses in IOM monitoring and evaluation processes; however, they demonstrate that IOM is seeking new strategies for capacity building.

Second, IOM has not conducted any structured assessments of capacity needs and factors that would enable or undermine improved responses to vulnerable migrants. Such assessments would, for instance, not only help to identify what information and skills officials and civil society figures require, but also would question whether the primary challenge is in fact individual capacities as opposed to financial or institutional factors.

Third, the absence of capacity needs assessments also means that IOM relies more on its existing relationships with migration-related government agencies when targeting officials for capacity building. This has, at times, meant less emphasis on government personnel at the borders or members of the security services who are among the first civil servants to engage with vulnerable migrants. While IOM has targeted some officials directly at the border as well as some members of the security services, many of the capacity building beneficiaries remain at the national level or in urban centers somewhat distant from border regions. This is in part due to the nature of IOM's relationships, which often tended to be strongest at the capital/national level and in other urban centers.

Fourth, capacity building methods have often focused on relatively rote pedagogical approaches and do not yet use hands-on methods such as extended simulations or experiential learning (i.e., actually engaging with migrants in the course of capacity building). This is a weakness particularly noted by IOM in Mesoamerica, where there is an increasing push to include a greater number of simulations in the future. However, these intentions have not yet led to results that the ET could observe.

Last, in both regions included in this evaluation, training participants noted that they often received one-off trainings rather than a more structured capacity building process that would allow them to build expertise. More than two-thirds of past capacity building participants included in this evaluation expressed a desire for further training to allow them to develop more advanced skills. The one-and-done strategy at present does not reflect international good practices for capacity building which calls for a more sustained process.<sup>5</sup>

## 4.2. Direct Assistance to Vulnerable Migrants

Direct assistance, like capacity building, differed widely across the two programs included in this evaluation. In the HoA program, direct assistance is IOM's primary focus – and the focus of nearly a quarter of IOM's program budget – while it constitutes only around 6% of IOM's program expenditure in Mesoamerica. In the HoA, direct assistance includes MRC services (including shelter, food, water, sanitation, and sometimes transportation), AVR of migrants, and ad hoc responses to sudden migration situations. The overall activities are relatively similar in Mesoamerica, though IOM has supported migrant shelters with limited amounts of funding rather than establishing MRCs like those in the HoA. In contrast, however, IOM has set up Information Hubs in Mesoamerica which provide advice and referrals to migrants.

The most effective and widely lauded forms of IOM direct assistance have generally come in response to acute migration-related emergencies. These have included the large-scale return of migrants from Yemen to the Horn of Africa and the sudden arrival of large numbers of Cuban and Haitian migrants into Central America, among others. IOM has performed strongly in these cases – providing appropriate forms of assistance in a timely manner – according to government officials which IOM supported in both regions. Women and men were both taken into consideration in these emergency responses. There would appear to be significant opportunities to link these sorts of emergency responses with the program's capacity building and emergency migration management pillars to assist governments in leading these sorts of responses in the future.

*Table 4: Most to Least Effective Forms of Direct Assistance, IOM Staff Survey Responses in HoA and Mesoamerica*

Horn of Africa: Forms of Assistance	Percentage Rating Effective or Very Effective	Mesoamerica: Forms of Assistance	Percentage Rating Effective or Very Effective
MRC support	100.0%	Information windows to provide information to the migrants	73.17%
Assisted voluntary return	84.6%	Direct assistance and voluntary return	73.81%
Unaccompanied children assistance and family reunification	76.9%	Communications campaigns	72.09%
Referral to partners	69.2%	Community-level prevention activities	73.81%
Psychosocial assistance	38.5%	UAC Response Units	47.37%

<sup>5</sup> UNDP. nd. *Capacity Development: A UNDP Primer*. United Nations Development Programme.

AVR is another area where IOM's direct assistance was praised by interviewees as well as by IOM staff – most of whom rated it as highly effective or effective in IOM staff surveys conducted in both regions (Table 4). The approaches to AVR differed widely. In the HoA program, IOM was focused on returning large numbers of migrants, particularly those who required emergency evacuation from Yemen. IOM's emphasis was on assisting large numbers of migrants with rather basic forms of assistance, including documentation support, transportation, food and water, temporary accommodation, and referral to partners in some instances. In contrast, the Mesoamerica program helped a small number of migrants who faced major challenges such as major health issues, domestic violence, and so on. In these instances, IOM was able to provide a more tailored approach to AVR. It is important to note that many of these tailored AVR cases in Mesoamerica involved women, including those who had been subjected to SGBV or other forms of abuse.

These two approaches, while different, are both appropriate for their respective contexts. In the HoA, IOM was stepping in to meet an emergency need and provided basic levels of AVR assistance – which more closely resembled emergency evacuation in many cases – in order to reach the greatest numbers of individuals. In Mesoamerica, IOM strictly stepped in to provide assistance where public institutions in the region were unable to do so. These tended to be among the most critical cases – and involved some AVR cases spanning the globe – where IOM's global reach was necessary to ensure safe and voluntary returns.

However, there are areas where IOM's direct assistance did demonstrate major challenges and faults. First, some of the physical infrastructure that IOM has supported have not been widely utilized. In the Horn of Africa (HoA), MRCs established by IOM were seeing relatively few migrants in parts of Ethiopia, Somaliland, and Puntland. Likewise, the majority of Information Hubs – in municipal offices, most commonly – set up under the Mesoamerica program were seeing fewer than one migrant beneficiary per day and tended to give very basic forms of referrals to migrants. In both the HoA and Mesoamerica programs, these physical pieces of migration infrastructure were being under-utilized due to a combination of limited marketing and communications, sub-optimal locations or placement, and changes in migration patterns. Yet in both regions IOM had not adequately analyzed these factors or developed strategies to increase the number of migrants taking advantage of MRCs or Information Hubs.

Second, the ET found that in the HoA program, MRCs were not being consistently monitored or effectively managed by IOM. This led to one MRC in Ethiopia being used by police to detain migrants in rough conditions and to the closure of another MRC for a period of three months without IOM seeming to be fully aware of the closure and the reasons for it.<sup>6</sup> Similar challenges were found in the IOM-operated Transit Center in Addis Ababa, which was being partly supported by the HoA program. However, these issues tended to stem from sub-optimal IOM management and oversight rather than from any fundamental flaw in the design of the direct assistance activities.

Last, IOM has yet to identify a strong means of linking direct assistance with capacity building in a comprehensive manner, though the Migration in Countries in Crisis Initiative

---

<sup>6</sup> In this instance, relevant IOM management provided three different explanations of the closure to the ET over time – after first denying the closure had occurred – thus make it appear that IOM did not have a handle on this situation.



(MICIC) provides an opportunity for IOM to do so (i.e., linking emergency migration preparedness trainings with actual direct assistance and practical contingency planning).

### **4.3. Links to Regional Migration Dialogues**

The programs have strengthened regional migration forums in both that the ET examined and has helped to inform their discussions and turn their discussions into tangible steps. However, IOM has not been able to overcome the tendency for these regional consultative processes (RCPs) to primarily serve as discussion forums that only rarely lead to improved regional cooperation or harmonization of approaches to migration and vulnerability.

IOM has played a significant role in RCPs in the regions examined; these include the Regional Committee on Mixed Migration (RCMM) in the Horn of Africa and the Regional Conference on Migration (RCM) in Central America. This has included essentially operating the RCMM and turning RCM priorities into tangible documents, guidelines, workshops and events.

Through its work with regional dialogues, IOM has developed some particularly noteworthy good practices. In the case of the RCMM, IOM does a strong job in Ethiopia and elsewhere of preparing government participants before major events and then follows up with those same participants to encourage them to act on recommendations adopted at RCMM meetings. In Central America, IOM has done a strong job developing guidelines, training materials, and other products that help governments and civil society to turn RCM discussions into concrete action.

However, accountability continues to pose major challenges for the non-binding dialogues that the ET examined in the Horn of Africa and Central America. While the non-binding nature of these dialogues is crucial to ensuring many governments' participation and openness to the process, it also means that they may yield less progress than anticipated. Stakeholders regularly consider options for tackling this dilemma – including independent monitoring and reporting of progress – but have not necessarily taken action on this front. While it is not IOM's responsibility to introduce any accountability mechanisms, it could perhaps do more to ensure that this issue is more forcefully tackled in a timely manner by the member countries of the RCMM and RCM.

The accountability issues noted above are further complicated by the wide range of topics that these forums often address and their tendencies to move on quickly from one meeting to the next rather than focusing on any one topic until progress has been achieved. This rapid jumping from one topic to the next makes it difficult for member countries to focus on any one issue, and it means that the RCMM and RCM are often hesitant to return to topics they recently address. While understandable, these regional forums would be stronger if they found a way to balance their wide agendas with tangible progress on specific, tangible issues. One good example here is the RCM's Regional Network on Migrant Children in Central America, which will enable continued attention to child migrants without requiring that the full RCM solely or primarily fixation on this issue. The Mesoamerica program was generally seen as directly and primarily responsible for the formation of this network.

#### **4.4. IOM-UNHCR Coordination**

IOM has coordinated consistently with UNHCR and other relevant UN agencies and has involved UNHCR and others in its program activities where relevant. Coordination as well as cooperation between IOM and UNHCR is strong, and referrals are operating smoothly and non-competitively between the organizations across all of the regions and countries visited by the ET. There is no sense of competition over beneficiaries or over relationships with government stakeholders.

IOM has also engaged effectively with other relevant UN agencies (and other international actors), including UNICEF, International Labor Organization (ILO), UN-WOMEN, UNDP, and the ICRC. These actors share information, participate in one another's events, and brainstorm ideas for future multi-agency programs. In Mesoamerica, IOM and these other agencies, as well as the Red Cross Movement, are engaging in shelter monitoring together, and IOM and UNHCR have shared staff members and premises in Costa Rica and Mexico. In the HoA, IOM and UNICEF are collaborating closely in a number of areas, including on the Transit Center that processes returnee children who are coming home to Ethiopia from abroad. These are just a small number of instances where IOM has collaborated effectively.

In the HoA program and to a lesser extent in Mesoamerica, these other UN agencies did express qualms about IOM's ability to engage in protection programming on par with other UN agencies given IOM's limited funding and expertise for protection. To quote the HoA regional summary report prepared by the ET: "interviewees raised concerns that even though the mechanics of referrals were done well – with UNHCR, for instance, bringing migrants to IOM's attention – they were frequently disappointed with IOM's ability to support vulnerable migrants. For instance, IOM was reportedly unable to assist significant numbers of child migrants transferred from other UN agencies to IOM in Yemen given that IOM had so few resources under this program and could only respond to cases deemed to be the most critical." As such, stakeholders noted that IOM could benefit from capacity building by other UN agencies on protection issues and that IOM and other agencies (e.g., UNHCR, UNWOMEN, UNICEF, etc.) might consider developing stronger internal referral mechanisms to support some of the most vulnerable cases. Despite this recognition, there has been little to no formal inter-agency capacity-building or expertise-sharing in the regions studied.

#### **4.5. Emergency Migration Management**

IOM has made some initial progress on the Emergency Migration Management (EMM) pillar, which was added to the program at the encouragement of DoS/PRM in FY 2016. However, given that this progress has been relatively limited – one regional workshop in Mesoamerica and no events during the evaluation in the HoA – the ET cannot reach any definitive findings on this element. Hence, the following observations are based primarily in interviews with IOM staff and with a small number of interviewees in Mesoamerica who had participated in the MICIC workshop.

First, there seems to be a degree of trepidation about this program component among both IOM staff members – outside of regional management hubs (i.e., Nairobi and San Jose) – and government officials. All but a few IOM staff interviewed by the ET only had a general awareness of MICIC and the EMM pillar, and government officials in the HoA reportedly felt

that MICIC's syntax ("countries in crisis") was disparaging or ominous. Communication around this pillar seems to have room for improvement.

Second, it was not clear to the ET why this pillar should be separated from the capacity building and direct assistance pillars. The relatively small number of interviewees familiar with the EMM pillar felt that all capacity building activities should include a strong emergency component and that IOM should be instructing government officials on emergency response in the course of their direct assistance activities (particularly where IOM is responding to migration crises in the regions in question).

Third, in Mesoamerica, interviewees familiar with the MICIC workshop felt that it was engaging and beneficial but that it would have the greatest impact if it was linked with emergency preparedness activities. These should, according to respondents, particularly include contingency planning among local, subnational and national government institutions, among migrant shelters, among civil society organizations, and among embassies and consulates.

## 5. Conclusion and Recommendations

### Section Summary:

- The RMPs implemented by IOM are increasingly complex and, to some extent, because of this complexity have struggled to reflect and implement a strategic, sustained approach to capacity building. It will be crucial for IOM simplify its regional programs and to focus on a deliberate, evidence based approach to capacity building.
- IOM's strategies must increasingly focus on working with sustainable local structures and particular civil and security service training academies to ensure that learning on migration is incorporated into national government systems and processes. IOM should increasingly focus on supporting these institutions rather than on providing trainings and workshops itself.
- Research, evaluation, and learning should be more fully incorporated into the programs in a number of ways – from the assessment of capacity needs to the evaluation of varied approaches to capacity building. This analytical work should be based on robust methods and should emphasize impact (e.g., how officials are doing their jobs differently as a result of trainings) rather than outputs and outcomes.

This evaluation found that the RMPs examined in the HoA and Mesoamerica have strong as well as weak elements. However, perhaps the greatest overarching quality is complexity. With relatively limited resources and broad regional portfolios, the programs have adopted numerous forms of capacity building, direct assistance, regional dialogue, and more. This breadth and complexity, combined with a lack of analysis and the absence of a clear strategy, means that IOM ultimately has little coherence or lasting impact. The current approach involves doing a lot in hopes that something works – rather than adopting a more modest set of activities, implementing them carefully, and studying outcomes and impacts in hopes of building upon the most effective tactics.

This section now presents a series of overarching and pillar-specific recommendations that IOM should consider as it refines and strengthens its RMPs in the HoA, Mesoamerica, and elsewhere in the future.

### 5.1. Overarching Recommendations

- **DoS/PRM should work with IOM to simplify and focus the activities within each RMP, focusing only on those deemed likely to build lasting government capacity, particularly on the so-called frontlines.** IOM will need to move away from its current activities and embrace a far more targeted approach rooted in capacity building both through trainings as well as through IOM-governmental collaboration in direct assistance and emergency response. This will require radical changes to programs in places, such as the HoA, where programs focus to a very limited extent on capacity building. It will also require a shift in some countries in Mesoamerica where IOM has focused on the central level to the exclusion of border officials/agents and subnational stakeholders.
- **IOM should, with supplemental resources and guidance from DoS/PRM, introduce systematic approaches to monitoring and evaluation of capacity building activities as well as to the other components of the RMPs.** This will involve training of IOM staff

on data collection and dedicating adequate resources and staff time not only to monitoring trainings and activities as they happen – but also to monitor their results three or six months later. If resources are available, this recommendation should extend beyond monitoring and evaluation and grow to include empirical research that builds upon the living laboratory that the RMPs provide. For instance, IOM can compare different pedagogical approaches to training and to awareness raising and how these affect knowledge, attitudes, and practices months later compared to a non-treatment control group.

- **In its ongoing programs and future proposals, IOM should articulate a capacity building strategy reflecting a medium-to-long-term vision with graduated steps for participating officials.** There is a real chance for the RMPs to avoid one-off trainings and instead provide a multi-session capacity building strategy for participants. This should involve increasingly complex content and skills-building as well as practical elements that link up with participants' day-to-day work. Such a strategy will require greater buy-in of participating government institutions and assurances that trained individuals will be (a) allowed to share content they gain with colleagues and (b) kept in their current roles for a minimum period of time.
- **IOM should design and implement a handover strategy in collaboration with DoS/PRM and partner institutions at the national and regional levels.** In order to help IOM and partner governments understand that these programs are intended to build capacities and ultimately be phased out, IOM should develop handover strategies with a timeline, generally, of approximately three years. The exact timeline should be adjusted according to each region in question, but the handover strategies should require governments to assume provision of IOM training modules and to increasingly take on direct assistance and emergency responses that IOM had typically supported.
- **IOM should broaden partnerships for capacity building, monitoring and evaluation, institutional learning, and more.** For instance, IOM should more closely involve universities and civil and security service training academies in the capacity building process. Issues related to migration and vulnerability should be integrated into these institutions' standard curriculums for police and border officials, teachers, medical professionals, and others in regions with high numbers of migrants. Partnerships with universities can further enable IOM to learn what capacity building approaches are and are not working effectively – thus freeing up IOM from some of these data collection and research responsibilities.

## **5.2. Pillar-Specific Recommendations**

The following recommendations are divided according to each program pillar. Readers are encouraged to review the recommendations sections of regional summary reports for the HoA and Mesoamerica programs in addition to the points below.

### *5.2.1. Capacity building*

- **IOM should focus on building an enabling environment for capacity building activities** among government agencies by countering turnover among training participants and ensuring that ToT strategies are allowed to come to fruition. This recommendation would require IOM to engage far more with partner governments in

order to ensure that they not only consent to participating in capacity building programs but that they also agree to certain standards such as preventing rapid turnover of trained individuals and giving opportunities for trained individuals to put their new information and skills into practice.

- **DoS/PRM should encourage IOM to develop strategies, including partnerships and e-learning, to increase the reach of capacity building activities.** Collaborations with civil service training academies (particularly for members of the security services) will be particularly important given that they not only have a wide reach but also given their generally sustainable role in building capacity in perpetuity – even once these programs are no longer in place.
- **IOM should make its training materials available to governments, universities, CSOs members, so that they can adapt such materials to specific audiences and needs.** Despite IOM's desire to maintain quality control over materials, it is clear that migration-related training and workshop materials would be disseminated far wider by partner governments if they are seen as internal rather than external. To this end IOM should provide its materials to partner governments in easy-to-edit formats and should work with those governments to tailor those materials for their own internal use (including in civil service training academies as noted above).
- **IOM should engage pedagogical experts to help in ensuring that capacity building activities are based in international good practices for teaching and learning.** This recommendation will help to ensure that IOM-provided trainings and workshops not only have accurate information but also that they make use of learning science to promote uptake and retention among participants. Such a recommendation can be pursued by IOM at a central level – with support from DoS/PRM – and then disseminated to the various regions where these types of programs are ongoing or upcoming.
- **IOM should ensure a greater focus on frontline personnel who engage with migrants, including members of the security and border services.** IOM's position in certain urban centers means that its capacity building may not always trickle down to the frontline actors involved in migration, including members of border and migration agencies. This tendency should be overcome, even if it requires taking IOM periodically out of its comfort zone and requires them to work with actors in the security services who may see migration primarily as a law-enforcement issue.

#### *5.2.2. Direct Assistance*

- **IOM should more closely link direct assistance with capacity building.** Aside from a small number of forms of direct assistance linked to urgent, acute emergencies, resources under these regional capacity building activities should not be allocated on more routine forms of humanitarian assistance or forms of direct assistance that are not focused on the most vulnerable. However, direct assistance should be provided where it can be linked up with capacity building and implemented as a sort of on-the-job training. These sorts of direct assistance activities should be scaled up.
- **DoS/PRM should discourage IOM from using US funding to support fixed infrastructure to respond to migration challenges unless routes are unlikely to**

**change substantially over time.** Given the cost of fixed infrastructure and the tendency of migration patterns to change seasonally and year-to-year, investments in migration centers and other buildings should be avoided except where migration is very stable and predictable. In other instances, IOM should work with other service providers and establish strong referral networks. Information windows, which provide guidance to migrants, could also be replaced by hotlines that could be advertised in areas (shops, shelters, taxis, etc.) that migrants frequent.

- **IOM and other local migration stakeholders should build networks among shelters and similar structures to allow them to share resources.** To ensure the most efficient use of materials and expertise, IOM should consider establishing networks that would allow civil society, government actors and others to share costly resources that are not always in demand such as psychologists, nurses, recreation materials, software, and so on. More broadly, IOM should foster collaboration among state and non-state migration actors in order to avoid duplication and increase efficiency.

#### *5.2.3. Regional Migration Dialogue*

- **Engage in cross-regional lessons learning among IOM personnel and participants in regional dialogues.** Given the diversity of RCPs around the world and their engagement on similar issues, IOM should promote information sharing among both its staff and RCP participants. These would allow them to exchange information, experiences, strategies, and, most importantly, materials in order to avoid duplicating efforts and re-creating the wheel.
- **IOM and relevant RCP secretariats and members should develop non-binding strategies for encouraging progress on commitments and recommendations from RCP meetings.** These may include monitoring reports, intensive follow up with participant governments, and other means that would allow RCPs to primarily remain non-binding while still promoting progress on key commitments. Such approaches could perhaps be pursued by IOM at a global level (e.g., monitoring reports) to avoid complicating the relationships of IOM personnel in each country or region with their government partners.

#### *5.2.4. IOM-UNHCR Coordination*

- **Engage in a structured process of cross-agency learning, particularly on protection among key populations,** to enable IOM to better support highly vulnerable migrants with tailored approaches. This would allow agencies like UNHCR, UNICEF, ILO, and others to more fully understand migrant protection while helping IOM to understand key protection messages related to children (from UNICEF) or women (from UNWOMEN or UNFPA).
- **IOM and other relevant UN agencies should begin the process of developing joint proposals where relevant, particularly in relation to minor migrants, SGBV survivors, and other key vulnerable populations.** Such proposals have been routinely discussed in both regions included in this evaluation but have not come to fruition due to the turnover of key personnel and a lack of institutional commitment by IOM and other UN agencies.



#### 5.2.5. Emergency Migration Management (EMM)

- **IOM should incorporate EMM messages into existing trainings where feasible and relevant.** Given the diversity of activities under this program and several stakeholders' sense of being overwhelmed, IOM should perhaps re-consider EMM as a stand-alone pillar and instead integrate it effectively into the capacity building pillar. Likewise, EMM-related messages (from MICIC) should be integrated into most capacity building activities.
- **IOM should focus on tangible contingency planning and drills to improve competencies and multi-stakeholder networks and not just knowledge and awareness.** IOM should promote emergency preparedness by developing – and rehearsing – contingency plans with migration stakeholders, whether under the banner of capacity building, direct assistance, or EMM. These sorts of activities should involve state and non-state actors, including consulates and municipal governments.

Beyond these specific recommendations, IOM should begin a process of considering – in each region that is home to a DoS/PRM-funded regional migration program – what the findings of this evaluation mean for their work. The ET stands ready to support these discussions within IOM and between IOM and DoS/PRM in order to promote the uptake of these evaluation findings and recommendations.

# Bibliography

- Adepoju, A. 2010. "Regional Organizations and Intra-Regional Migration in Sub-Saharan Africa: Challenges and Prospects", *International Migration*, 39(6), pp. 43-59.
- Altai Consulting. 2016. *Addressing Mixed Migration Flows in Eastern Africa: Executive Summary*. Prepared by Altai Consulting for Expertise France.
- Altai Consulting. 2016. *Addressing Mixed Migration Flows in Eastern Africa: Somalia MRC Sections*. Prepared by Altai Consulting for Expertise France.
- Celesia, A., Morlachetti, A. and Luna, M. 2014. *Manual sobre estándares internacionales de derechos humanos aplicables a los niños, niñas y adolescentes migrantes*. RELAF, Save the Children and UNICEF.
- Eade, D. 2007. "Capacity building: who builds whose capacity?", *Development in Practice*, 17(405), pp. 630-639.
- ECOWAS. 2008. *ECOWAS Common Approach on Migration*. Economic Community of West African States.
- FAO. 2013. *Good practices definition*.  
[www.fao.org/capacitydevelopment/goodpractices/gphome/en](http://www.fao.org/capacitydevelopment/goodpractices/gphome/en)
- Graham, C. 2002. *Strengthening Institutional Capacity in Poor Countries: Shoring Up Institutions, Reducing Global Poverty*. Brookings Institution.
- GTZ. 2010. *Best Practices in Capacity Building Approaches*. German Technical Cooperation.
- GTZ. 2010. *Critical Assessment of the ECBP Approach in the Context of Ethiopia's Economic Development and International Experiences*. German Technical Cooperation.
- Hervy, A. and Gilboy, A. 2014. *Good Practices in Leveraging Long-term Training for Institutional Capacity Strengthening*. USAID.
- IFRC. n.d. "What is vulnerability?", <http://www.ifrc.org/en/what-we-do/disaster-management/about-disasters/what-is-a-disaster/what-is-vulnerability/>.
- IOM and the Government of Ethiopia. 2016. *Joint Meeting among Government Agencies to Review the Progress towards the Implementation of the Fifth RMMC Meeting Recommendations March 4, 2016, Ministry of Justice (MoJ), Addis Ababa*.
- IOM and the Government of Ethiopia. 2016. *NFF on PRM Project: Horn/ Gulf of Aden/Yemen: Improving Protection of Migrants, Phase VI, joint meeting among government agencies to review and endorse the two regional SOPs and review the progress towards the implementation of 5th RMMC meeting recommendations, Aphrodite Hotel, Addis Ababa 8 July, 2016*.
- IOM Ethiopia. 2015. "Bi weekly report of the EMRC", dated November 5, 2015.
- IOM Ethiopia. 2015. "Bi weekly report of the EMRC", dated October 10, 2015.

- IOM Ethiopia. 2015. "Bi weekly report of the EMRC", dated September 5, 2015.
- IOM Ethiopia. 2016. "Migrant satisfaction form analyzed [sic]".
- IOM Ethiopia. 2016. "Monthly report of the EMRC in Mettema sub offices", dated March 25, 2016.
- IOM Ethiopia. 2016. "Monthly mixed migration report from country offices", dated March 2016.
- IOM Ethiopia. 2016. *Migration management practitioner perceptions survey*.
- IOM Ethiopia. 2017. "Project implementation agreement between the International Organization for Migration and the Amhara National Regional State Bureau of Labor and Social Affairs".
- IOM Ethiopia. n.d. "Reports of the EMRC", undated.
- IOM, n.d. Essentials of Migration Management: Volume One – Migration Management Foundations, [http://www.rcmvs.org/documentos/IOM\\_EMM/index.html](http://www.rcmvs.org/documentos/IOM_EMM/index.html).
- IOM. 2003. *Capacity Building in Migration Management*. IOM.
- IOM. 2010. *Migrant Resource Centers – An initial assessment*. IOM Research Series, No.40. IOM.
- IOM. 2014. "Regional Cooperation and Capacity Building", presentation for a Workshop on strengthening the collection and use of International Migration data for Development. Addis Ababa, 2014.
- IOM. 2014. *IOM Regional Strategy for Central and North America and the Caribbean 2014-2016*. IOM.
- IOM. 2015. *Budget: Horn/Gulf of Aden/Yemen: Improving Protection of Migrants, Phase VI*.
- IOM. 2015. *IOM Voluntary Contributions for Vulnerable Migrant Programs: Horn/Gulf of Aden/Yemen: Improving Protection of Migrants (Phase VII) – Interim Financial Report*.
- IOM. 2015. *Regional Program to Strengthen Capacities to Protect and Assist Vulnerable Migrants in Mesoamerica (Mesoamerica Program), Phase VI*.
- IOM. 2015. *Work Plan: Phase VI proposed activities (September 2015 – August 2016)*. Mesoamerica.
- IOM. 2016. "IOM Rolls Out Tools for Protection of Vulnerable Migrants in Zambia". IOM.
- IOM. 2016. "PRM Horn of Africa Progress Chart", dated December 5, 2016.
- IOM. 2016. *Assessing the Evidence: Migration, Environment, and Climate Change in Kenya*. IOM.
- IOM. 2016. *Assessment of Border Crossing Points in the Volta and Western Regions and Training Capacity of Ghana Immigration Service*. IOM.
- IOM. 2016. *Budget Narrative for PRM Regional Mixed Migration Programme: Horn of Africa &*

*Yemen, Phase VII, 2016-2017.*

- IOM. 2016. *Budget: Horn/Gulf of Aden/Yemen: Improving Protection of Migrants, Phase VII.*
- IOM. 2016. *Final Report: Migration Response Center (MRC) Regional Meeting, The Ambassador Hotel - Hargeisa, Somaliland, 09-10 August 2016.*
- IOM. 2016. IOM Definition of "Migrant". IOM.
- IOM. 2016. *Migration Governance Framework: The Essential Elements for Facilitating Orderly, Safely, Regular and Responsible Migration and Mobility of People through Planned and Well Managed Migration Policies.* IOM.
- IOM. 2016. *Migration Initiatives: Innovating Approach on Migration Governance.* IOM
- IOM. 2016. *OIG Performance Monitoring Visit Report.* IOM, Geneva.
- IOM. 2016. *Project Proposal: Horn/Gulf of Aden/Yemen: Improving Protection of Migrants, Phase VII.*
- IOM. 2016. *Project Proposal: Regional Program to Strengthen Capacities to Protect and Assist Vulnerable Migrants in Mesoamerica (Mesoamerica Program), Phase VII.*
- IOM. 2016. *Regional Mixed Migration Program: Migration Response Center (MRC): MRC Data Collection System, August 2016.*
- IOM. 2016. *Regional Mixed Migration Program: Migration Response Center (MRC): MRC Data Collection System, December 2016.*
- IOM. 2016. *Regional Mixed Migration Program: Migration Response Center (MRC): MRC Data Collection System, July 2016.*
- IOM. 2016. *Regional Mixed Migration Program: Migration Response Center (MRC): MRC Data Collection System, November 2016.*
- IOM. 2016. *Regional Mixed Migration Program: Migration Response Center (MRC): MRC Data Collection System, October 2016.*
- IOM. 2016. *Regional Mixed Migration Program: Migration Response Center (MRC): MRC Data Collection System, September 2016.*
- IOM. 2016. *Results Matrix for the Mesoamerica Regional Migration Program.*
- IOM. 2016. *Revised Budget: Phase VII, Regional Program to Strengthen Capacities to Protect and Assist Vulnerable Migrants in Mesoamerica, May 27.*
- IOM. 2016. *Work Plan: Phase VII proposed activities (October 2016 – September 2017). Mesoamerica.*
- IOM. 2017. *4th Interim Report to PRM - Horn/Gulf of Aden/Yemen: Improving Protection of Migrants VI.*
- IOM. n.d. *MRC Data Registration Form, undated.*

- IOM. n.d. *MRC Screening Form*, undated.
- JHSAIS. 2013. *100 Best Practices in the Protection of Migrant Workers*. John Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.
- Ministry of Interior Puntland. 2016. *Entry Monitoring Monthly Update: October 2016*.
- Nyaoro, D., Schade, J., and Schmidt, K. 2016. *Assessing evidence – migration, environment and climate change in Kenya*. IOM.
- OECD, 2010 *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management*.
- París Pombo M.C, Ley Cervantes M and Peña Muñoz J. 2016. *Migrantes en México Vulnerabilidad y Riesgos: Un Estudio Teórico para el Programa de Fortalecimiento Insitucional “Reducir la Vulnerabilidad de Migrantes en Emergencias”*. IOM and COLEF.
- PRM. 2014. *Guidelines for Field Monitoring of PRM Migration Programs*. Department of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM).
- PRM/IOM. 2016. “FY 2016 PRM Regional Migration Program Model”.
- PRM/IOM. n.d. “Results Matrix” for the Regional Migration Programs.
- RCMM. 2015. *Recommendations from the 5th Meeting of the Regional Committee on Mixed Migration*. Djibouti: Regional Committee on Mixed Migration.
- Senior Policy Operating Group Grantmaking Committee (SPOGGC) 2012. *Promising Practices – a Review of US Government-funded Anti-trafficking in Persons Programs*.
- Sistema Nacional DIF/IOM. 2015. *Marco Jurídico del Protocolo de Atención para Niñas, Niños y Adolescentes Migrantes no Acompañados o Separados que se Encuentren Albergados*.
- Stewart, R. 2013. *Independent Evaluation of IOM’s Project “Horn/Gulf of Aden/Yemen: Improving Protection of Migrants –Phase III”: Final Evaluation Report*. International Organisation for Migration.
- Treviño, M. 2015. *Evaluation of the IOM Project “Improving the Protection of Vulnerable Migrants Travelling through the Horn of Africa, 2013-2015, and Previous Phases”: Evaluation Report*.
- UN.GIFT.2010. *Human Trafficking and Business: Good Practices to Prevent and Combat Human Trafficking*.
- UNCDF. 2007. *Delivering the Goods: Building Local Government Capacity to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals*. United Nations Capital Development Fund.
- UNDP. nd. *Capacity Development: A UNDP Primer*. United Nations Development Programme.
- UNITAR. 2015. *Human Trafficking and the Role of the Local Governments – Good Practices*,

*Challenges and the Way Forward.* UNITAR.

UNODC. 2010. *Toolkit to Combat Smuggling of Migrants: Tool 10 - Capacity-building and training.* United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

USAID. 2013. *Counter-Trafficking Field Guide.* USAID.

Wittbold, B. 2015. *Enhancing Resilience and Protection of Marginalized Communities Affected by Protracted Conflicts and Effects of Adverse Climatic Conditions in Kenya.* IOM/Sida.

# Annex A: Inclusion of International Good Practices

This table presents the various good practices identified in the Evaluation Team's desk-review as part of this evaluation. The authors then discuss the degree to which several of these good practices were or were not reflected in the Horn of Africa/Yemen and Mesoamerica programs.

Practice/Lesson	Inclusion in the PRM/IOM Model and Programs
<b>Migration Management</b>	
<i>Border control-focused strategies are important but insufficient.</i>	The programs included in this evaluation were not particularly focused on border control and instead worked primarily with civilian and protection actors within government and civil society. However, the pendulum may have swung a bit too far away from border control, and there is an evident need for IOM to engage more with the border control agencies and security services that are often the first point of contact for many migrants.
<i>Attitudes often require as much attention as knowledge and skills when it comes to more humanely managing migration, particularly among vulnerable populations.</i>	This is an area where IOM has excelled, focusing extensively on changing attitudes among government officials and communities that host migrants along their journeys. This is done via engaging means at trainings and workshops as well as through public communications (e.g., radio announcements and public art). However, the focus on attitudes has not necessarily been adequately accompanied by a focus on skills, as noted in the full report.
<i>Coordination and partnerships are crucial given the diversity of stakeholders involved in migration management, particularly at the regional level and where vulnerable populations are involved.</i>	IOM has been very active in coordinating with other stakeholders and in developing partnerships. This applies both to UN coordination among IOM, UNHCR, UNICEF, ILO, UNFPA and others – as well as to coordination and partnerships with governmental and civil society actors at multiple levels.
<i>Information and awareness-raising campaigns have a mixed record in discouraging migration among at-risk populations.</i>	IOM is implementing these sorts of campaigns in Ethiopia as well as in parts of Central America. However, IOM has been careful not to discourage migration and instead to provide information about the risks posed by migration in order to counteract those individuals – whether relatives or smugglers – who may attempt to portray migration in a purely rosy light.
<i>Livelihood support is often more beneficial in discouraging irregular migration than</i>	This is a lesson that was repeatedly emphasized in the HoA and to a lesser extent in Mesoamerica. However, the limited amounts of money do not necessarily make it

<i>information campaigns.</i>	feasible for IOM to be engaging in livelihoods work under this program. Doing so would also go against the program's primary intent, as established by DoS/PRM, to build stakeholder capacity. This is not a migration-reduction program, it is a program aimed at building capacities in order, in part, to protect vulnerable migrants.
<i>Front-line border officials with the appropriate skills and training are particularly integral with regards to protecting vulnerable migrants.</i>	This issue is at the core of the regional migration programs (RMPs) covered by this evaluation. IOM has generally provided training, but two gaps exist when it comes to meeting this good practice. Firstly, IOM has not necessarily focused on skills and has instead focused on information and attitudes. Secondly, IOM has only partly reached front-line officials; much of the capacity building targets individuals at the national and subnational levels who might not be at the front lines encountering migrants on their journeys. That is, IOM often focuses on the second line than necessarily on the front lines in all cases.
<i>Training must also be accompanied by sufficient infrastructure, particularly in relation to healthcare.</i>	This is an important issue but is also somewhat beyond the scope of these RMPs, which do not necessarily contain large-scale resources for infrastructure such as healthcare facilities. That said, IOM has focused on creating connections with healthcare providers and other service providers in the regions where it operates.
<i>Migrant Resource Centers (MRCs) are crucial in supporting orderly migration and addressing vulnerable migrants.</i>	This is an issue that IOM has addressed in the HoA program, though, as outlined in the full report and in the HoA regional summary report, MRCs have not always been implemented in the best possible way. They receive relatively limited numbers of migrants, have under-qualified staff members in some instances, and are not closely monitored by IOM in certain situations. In the Mesoamerica program, there are no MRCs – though IOM has attempted to provide similar services through existing migrant shelters and through Information Hubs that provide referrals to migrants.
<i>The private sector may play a role in combating TIP and in rescuing victims, particularly women and children.</i>	This issue is not particularly relevant to this program given that it does not focus on saving trafficked persons from involuntary employment and so on. The main role that the private sector could be playing is in providing job skills training or other services to would-be migrants in host communities. This is an issue that some stakeholders in the region have discussed, but it is not necessarily part of this program.
<i>A holistic approach to migration</i>	This good practice is generally addressed by the RMPs



<i>management is necessary, particularly where vulnerable migrants are involved.</i>	included in this evaluation. They include several sectors and actors and thus could be described as “holistic”.
<i>Notions of vulnerability and migration may need to increasingly account for the effects of climate change.</i>	While climate change is not an overt part of these programs, the links between climate change and migration are evident in the HoA – where a drought is impelling migrants to move. Likewise, environmental degradation (though not necessarily climate change) was raised as a driver of migration within the Mesoamerica program as well during trainings provided by IOM and partners.
<b>Capacity Building</b>	
<i>Capacity building should be grounded in detailed assessments of needs and pathways to change.</i>	This is an issue that is raised in this report as well as in the two regional summary reports. Capacity building activities were grounded in general perceptions of capacity needs and discussions with relevant officials. However, no methodical analyses were conducted to determine what capacities were most needed and whether knowledge, attitudes, skills, resources, or institutional factors were the main impediments to improved migration management and protection for vulnerable migrants. This is a major oversight.
<i>Local ownership of capacity building should be ensured from the very beginning, including in terms of identifying capacity priorities.</i>	Local ownership has been pursued to some extent, with officials being consulted on their training needs. However, they are not closely involved in the development of course content, methods, and so on. Nor have trainings been adequately integrated into national civil service and border agency training institutions/departments. These programs tend to reflect more consultation rather than a meaningful approach to local ownership.
<i>With regards to developing governmental capacity, a typical focus on central state institutions should be accompanied by greater attention to subnational and local actors.</i>	IOM has generally focused on national, subnational, and local officials. This was particularly the case in parts of Mesoamerica where program staff were generally located at the border areas rather than in national capitals. In the HoA program this multi-level training was not as evident. In Ethiopia had a very limited staff presence outside of Addis and thus provided very limited training to officials in border areas home to MRCs such as Metema and Mile or Semera.
<i>One-off trainings should generally be avoided in preference for longer-term, sustained engagement with individuals and institutions.</i>	This is another gap in both the RMPs. Almost all trainings provided by IOM were one-off rather than part of sustained capacity building agendas. In some cases officials had attended more than one training, but the various trainings and workshops were not necessarily

	intended to provide an integrated set with complementary or increasingly complex content.
<i>Mentoring and “twinning” arrangements should be considered where appropriate and feasible.</i>	These sorts of approaches were not adopted by IOM in the RMPs, though this report does call for IOM to integrate its direct assistance and capacity building work – particularly in responding to migration emergencies. Doing so would allow IOM to provide a sort of on-the-job mentorship to officials. Some government officials in Central America also called for the introduction of “twinning” arrangements where they would spend time with and learn from counterparts elsewhere in the Americas.
<i>New technologies should be leveraged in order to broaden capacity building.</i>	This is not happening in the HoA program but was evident in Mesoamerica, where e-learning was being used in order to bring training to greater numbers of people. Marketing, however, has been limited, and experts say that the pedagogical approach offered in some of the courses (e.g., long videos of individuals talking into the camera) does not necessarily represent best practices for teaching and learning.
<i>Strategic local partnerships are an integral element of capacity building and help to ensure that national/local actors can take up or sustain capacity development efforts.</i>	IOM has developed collaborations with local institutions where it operates. These institutions are consulted on the design of various capacity building activities. However, these relationships have not matured to the point of strategic partnerships in which the local actors are gradually preparing to take on IOM’s capacity building materials or responsibilities as their own. This is something recommended in this report as well as in the regional summary reports for the HoA and Mesoamerica.
<i>Individual capacity building, while important, must be combined with institutional changes and the promotion of an enabling environment.</i>	This is an area that has not happened in the RMPs implemented by IOM. Training has targeted individuals, but IOM has not necessarily worked with institutions to ensure that trained personnel will be (a) kept in place and (b) permitted to put their new knowledge and skills into practice.
<i>Incentive structures should be in place – or introduced – which will reward improvements in individual or institutional capacity in order to encourage continuous growth.</i>	Given the size and complexity of institutions that these programs address, it is not necessarily feasible for IOM to ensure that they reward individuals who have received training. However, IOM has been cognizant of incentive structures and has provided certificates and other forms of documentation that will enable training participants to receive institutional credit for participating in trainings.
<i>“Soft skills” related to communication, management/leadership, dispute</i>	These skills have been included in trainings, particularly those in Mesoamerica that deal with psychosocial assistance. In addition, IOM has indirectly helped

<i>resolution, and more should also be emphasized in most capacity development initiatives.<sup>7</sup></i>	governmental and civil society actors to deal with one another – to communicate effectively and resolve disputes – as part of their networking and coordination activities.
<i>Capacity development should include plans to encourage the broader dissemination and uptake of skills and capabilities.</i>	This has happened to some extent, particularly in the Mesoamerica program, where training of trainers (ToT) is the default approach. Such an approach was far less evident in the HoA program. However, challenges remain for ToT approaches, particularly where trained trainers are ultimately not able to replicate the training as intended due to time limitations or internal jealousies within their institutions.
<i>Detailed monitoring and evaluation of capacity building and its medium-to-long-term effects should be included in international programs to measure effectiveness and allow adjustments in strategies and activities.</i>	This has not happened on a meaningful level. In the HoA program, M&E of capacity building activities has been nearly absent. In the Mesoamerica program trainings and workshops have often included pre- and post-tests of participants; however, these are not particularly methodologically rigorous and are not being used to enable mid-course corrections in capacity building activities.
<i>Handover or exit strategies should be developed from the very beginning.</i>	These have yet to be developed yet, and they are called for in this report as well as in the regional summary reports for the HoA and Mesoamerica programs.
<i>Planning and funding for capacity building initiatives, particularly where complex institutional arrangements are involved, should be predictable and long-term in nature rather than subjected to short-term budgets.</i>	The budgets for these programs have been annual in nature but do have a degree of predictability given that IOM has provided continuous support year after year. However, IOM has been hesitant to engage in multi-year planning.

<sup>7</sup> Hervy and Gilboy, *Good Practices in Leveraging Long-term Training for Institutional Capacity Strengthening*, 2014.

## Annex B: Evaluation Methodology (from the Inception/Desk Review Report)

The evaluation questions will be addressed through an evaluation design that applies both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods including: document/desk review, key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), and mini-surveys. The use of multiple methods to answer elements of the same questions will increase the internal validity of the findings and conclusions.

### Sampling approach

The ET will apply a purposive sampling technique to determine which sites and partners to visit and the groups and individuals with whom to conduct KIIs, FGDs, and mini surveys. Locations for site visits will be chosen based on the number of stakeholders available in each location, the timing of program activities which the team could observe, and, most importantly, the potential ability to access migrants/direct beneficiaries in various field locations. The initial data collection will inform the sampling strategy by providing the ET with greater insight into the scope of Regional Migration Program services, programs, partners, stakeholders, and beneficiaries, and thus the criteria upon which to draw a sample.

The data collection tools will be standard, but flexible enough to reflect the unique operating environment and its' respective approach to supporting vulnerable migrants and building the capacity of government officials. All KII and FGD protocols will be semi-structured to provide the ET with flexibility to explore certain topics in greater depth as necessary and appropriate. That said, they will apply adequate structure to enable comparisons across countries and, where appropriate, between regions.

**KIIs:** The ET will conduct KIIs to investigate the experiences, behaviors, and perspectives of implementers, beneficiaries, and partners of the Regional Migration Programs as well as to provide insight into how the programs operate beyond what is described in the documents. Interviews with PRM staff will help the ET understand implementation from a management perspective, which will be critical for the development of useful tools and guidance. KIIs with IOM, government officials, members of the Regional Committee on Mixed Migration, NGOs, and multilateral organizations will help the team identify the programs' alignment with good practices and outputs and outcomes in terms of capacity building and enhanced regional migration management. Interviewees with high-level individuals (e.g., from ministries or UNHCR or the RCMM) will be selected through consultation with IOM. However, in the case of direct beneficiaries such as training recipients, the evaluation team will seek to select these independently from available lists of beneficiaries.

**FGDs:** The team will conduct FGDs with different groups of refugees and migrants as well as with training participants and others, as appropriate. FGDs will inform the team about how individuals' needs and preferences have been met, satisfaction with past and current services/assistance, and the extent to which IOM has been responsive to their feedback. FGD participants will be grouped according to sex, age cohorts, ethnicity, and vulnerability status – as appropriate – to capture differences in experiences and perspectives. If feasible,

the ET will conduct FGDs with designated vulnerable individuals or groups such as survivors of trafficking, kidnapping, or sexual violence, unaccompanied children, members of the LGBT community, and the physically disabled.<sup>8</sup> Of course, such beneficiaries may not always be readily available for FGDs. FGD participants will be selected by the ET in consultation with IOM field staff.

**Site Visits:** The ET will conduct site observations of a selection of sites in both regions. In the Horn of Africa, site visits may include Migration Response Centers and Immigration and Border Patrol Offices. In Mesoamerica, site visits may include community and youth centers, shelters, schools, and/or Customs Authority offices. The team will utilize checklists of best practices when appropriate to support with the evaluation of effectiveness and appropriateness of services provided.<sup>9</sup>

**Mini-surveys:** The ET will conduct quantitative mini-surveys with a selection of key informants, particularly those that the ET may not be able to consult in person. Specifically, we will sample government officials who have participated in capacity building activities, stakeholders in the regional migration dialogues or consultative processes (RCPs), Migration Response Center staff members, and members of the Working Group on Migrant Children. Invitations to complete the mini-surveys will be sent to all relevant individuals rather than selecting a sub-set of, for instance, training participants. Mini-surveys will allow the ET to collect evidence from a wider population of informants than would otherwise be possible given time and resource limitations. Focused on a narrowly defined issue or sub-set of questions, the mini-surveys will consist of approximately 10-15 closed-ended questions that can be answered in less than 10 minutes. Surveys will be administered either via mobile phones or email, depending on the final selection of participants. Responses will be recorded using an application such as Survey Monkey, Magpi, or Open Data Kit (ODK) to ensure that data are immediately aggregated and available for review by the team. The responses to any such surveys will be reviewed only by the ET and not by IOM or PRM staff.

The methods noted above will be applied in six countries across two regional evaluations, including three countries in the Horn of Africa and a further three in Mesoamerica. The ET will jointly conduct the first country evaluations in each region, including Kenya and Costa Rica – which serve as the management hubs for the regional programs – and then split up for the second and third evaluations. The subsequent field evaluations will include one core team member working with a local researcher in each country.

### Country visit selection

Upon reviewing program documents, the ET took up the question of country visit selection to determine where to conduct field work. Below the proposed country visit locations and selection criteria are summarized; the ET is open to alternative suggestions.

**Horn of Africa Kenya, Ethiopia, and Djibouti.** Kenya, where the ET intends to spend one week, was selected given that it serves as the management hub for the regional

<sup>8</sup> Where the ET will engage with members of particularly vulnerable groups, the ET will seek approval through Social Impact's Internal Review Board (IRB), which ensures that data collection, management, and use safeguards respondents' inputs and that all such encounters are based on informed consent.

<sup>9</sup> The ET has not included checklists for the site visits in the annexes to this report given that the specific checklists to be utilized will depend heavily on the types of facilities and/or trainings which the evaluators will observe.



program and given that several regional institutions are headquartered there. The ET will then proceed to Ethiopia and Djibouti for two to three weeks each; these two countries which were selected given the level of programmatic activity in each (according to the FY 2016 proposal/appeal). Ethiopia is home to two MRCs supported through the program and has the largest awareness raising component of any country in the regional program and the second highest level of humanitarian assistance (after Yemen) provided through the regional program. Djibouti also has a high level of programmatic activities and from 2013-15 had the third highest number of program beneficiaries after Yemen and Somaliland, both of which would be more difficult to access for political and security reasons.

**Mesoamerica Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Mexico.** Costa Rica has been selected given that it is both the management hub for the program and has a sizable level of activities; the ET will spend two weeks before splitting and traveling to Guatemala and Mexico. Guatemala is home to a full range of regional program activities and faces a diverse array of migration issues. Mexico was selected with input from DoS/PRM given that it is also home to a normal range of program activities and serves as a major transit point for migrants from the Americas.

*Note:* The ET will conduct an out briefing at the conclusion of field work in each region in Kenya and Costa Rica though not necessarily at the country level.

## **Analysis**

The ET leader will oversee and manage systematic analysis of qualitative and quantitative data. Mini-survey data will be exported and analyzed. Team members will transcribe KII and FGD notes in real-time, cleaning and sharing electronic summaries on a rolling basis. The ET will use content, trend, and pattern analysis to identify response categories and to elucidate emergent themes and contextual factors. The ET will also employ data triangulation: an analysis strategy in which qualitative and quantitative data are first analyzed independently. Findings from each data set are then used to inform and explain findings across data types. Triangulation of data ensures that more than one set of findings bears on the ET's assessment of the Regional Programs' contribution to the achievement of expected results and most importantly, why.

The ET will capture preliminary findings and conclusions in an evaluation findings matrix that categorizes analysis and recommendations by evaluation question. The matrix will (a) ensure that the team prepares a systematic and thorough response to each evaluation question, (b) verify that preliminary analysis accounts for gender and social dimensions, (c) identify any gaps where additional clarification or analysis may be necessary, and (d) serve as the basis for developing the draft evaluation reports at the regional and global levels.

## **Approach to Gender and Vulnerability**

The evaluation methodology will be closely attuned to gender and will seek to capture perspectives from women and men, girls and boys, and from particularly vulnerable groups, including members of the LGBT communities. To enable this process, the ET includes one man and one woman, and local members of the team will be selected in a manner that

reflects gender concerns and which will also reflect any identity issues (e.g., attempting to include members of indigenous populations where appropriate).

Vulnerability is a key part of the program and, hence, will be a key part of the evaluation as the team not only looks at whether migration management capacity has improved but also at whether government institutions, civil society, IOM, and others across the regions in question are better able to recognize and respond to the unique needs of vulnerable migrants.

In terms of the actual conduct of the evaluation and the analysis process, the ET will systematically compare responses from male and female respondents (e.g., government officials, civil society organizations, and migrants). In addition, the team will address the extent to which different forms of vulnerability – several of which have gendered dimensions – have been addressed to differing extents in the programs (e.g., labor migrants versus victims of trafficking or SGBV). This will be done by reviewing interview and FGD records, which will include questions related to vulnerability, as well as by considering training materials and other physical records available from IOM.

## Annex C: Glossary

*The following definitions were established in the inception report for this evaluation. They are included here for the readers' reference.*

**Migrant:** Any person who is moving or has moved across an international border or within a State away from his/her habitual place of residence, regardless of (1) the person's legal status; (2) whether the movement is voluntary or involuntary; (3) what the causes for the movement are; or (4) what the length of the stay is.<sup>10</sup>

**Mixed migration:** Complex population movements including refugees, asylum seekers, economic migrants and other migrants'. Unaccompanied minors, environmental migrants, smuggled persons, victims of trafficking and stranded migrants, among others, may also form part of a mixed flow.<sup>11</sup>

**Irregular migration:** The movement of a person to a new place of residence or transit using irregular or illegal means, without valid documents or by carrying forged documents. This term also covers the smuggling of migrants (IOM).<sup>12</sup>

**Trafficking:** Trafficking in persons shall mean the recruitment, transportation, transfer, harboring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of other forms of coercion, of abduction, of fraud, of deception, of the abuse of power or of a position of vulnerability or of giving or receiving of payments or benefits to achieve the consent of a person having control over another person, for the purpose of exploitation. Exploitation shall include, at a minimum, the exploitation of the prostitution of others or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labor or services, slavery or practices similar to slavery, servitude or the removal of organs.<sup>13</sup>

**Migration management:** A diverse array of practices aimed at strengthening the ability of persons to move between countries safely and efficiently with minimal delay and appropriate documentation while countering exploitation and abuse. Migration management is primarily concerned with the safety of migrants and the developmental benefits of migration while mitigating harm.<sup>14</sup>

**Capacity building:** The process of strengthening or developing an institution's ability to define and fulfill its mandate, whether through providing resources, addressing skills/capability gaps, introducing processes/policies/procedures, enhancing networks/relationships, or through any other combination of means.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> IOM, "IOM Definition of 'Migrant'", 2016, <https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/about-iom/IOM-definition-of-a-migrant-15March2016.pdf>.

<sup>11</sup> Mixed Migration Hub, "What is mixed migration?", n.d., [http://www.mixedmigrationhub.org/about\\_trashed/what-mixed-migration-is/](http://www.mixedmigrationhub.org/about_trashed/what-mixed-migration-is/).

<sup>12</sup> IOM, *Essentials of Migration Management: Volume One – Migration Management Foundations*, n.d., [http://www.rcmvs.org/documentos/IOM\\_EMM/index.html](http://www.rcmvs.org/documentos/IOM_EMM/index.html).

<sup>13</sup> Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in persons, especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (General Assembly Resolution 55/25, Annex II), 2000.

<sup>14</sup> IOM, *Essentials of Migration Management*, see Section 1.2. This definition has been adapted and extrapolated from this document and is not taken verbatim.

<sup>15</sup> Adapted from UNDP, *Capacity Development: A UNDP Primer*, n.d.



**Vulnerability:** Often defined as diminished capacity of an individual or group to anticipate, cope with, resist and recover from a stressful experience (e.g., migration, disasters, conflict, etc.), this evaluation also defines vulnerability as those personal or communal characteristics which increase an individual's exposure to risk and predation.<sup>16</sup>

**Good practice:** A good practice is not only a practice that is good, but a practice that has been proven to work well and produce good results and is therefore recommended as a model. This term has been selected in place of "best practice" to reflect the sentiment that no single approach or practice is necessarily the "best" for all situations and contexts.<sup>17</sup>

**Lessons learned:** This term refers to weaknesses or areas for improvement in the preparation, design, and implementation of humanitarian and development programming which have generally been identified in the course of evaluations or research. Lessons often pertain to processes, outcomes, or impacts.

---

<sup>16</sup> IFRC, "What is vulnerability?" n.d., <http://www.ifrc.org/en/what-we-do/disaster-management/about-disasters/what-is-a-disaster/what-is-vulnerability/>.

<sup>17</sup> FAO, "Global practice template", March 2014.

## Annex D: Checklists and Monitoring Tools

The following checklists, requested in the Statement of Work for this evaluation, are intended to enable DoS/PRM to provide guidance to IOM, to assess proposals for the regional migration programs, and to monitor these programs in the field.

### Checklist 1: Providing Guidance on Proposals to IOM

The following list of criteria is based on this evaluation, including the review of good practices contained in the desk review and the findings of the two regional evaluations in the Horn of Africa and Mesoamerica. DoS/PRM should use this checklist to assess and score calls for proposals and other guidance materials that are provided to IOM as IOM – or other partners in the future – develop program documents.

No.	Criteria	Score (1 5) <sup>18</sup>	Notes
	<b>Capacity Building</b>		
1	To what extent does the call for proposals require/request an explanation of how capacity building needs were systematically identified through credible data analysis and (not or) stakeholder consultations?		
2	To what extent does the call for proposals require/request a strategy for engaging with civil service training academies or border/migration institutes?		
3	To what extent does the call for proposals require/request a strategy to create an enabling environment for capacity building (e.g., gaining commitments from governments to retain trained individuals and exercise newly acquired skills)?		
4	To what extent does the call for proposals reflect a graduated approach to capacity building that goes from introductory to expert material – as opposed to a one-off approach?		
5	To what extent does the call for proposals request that applicants include hands-on learning opportunities, including roleplays, simulations, and on-the-job trainings?		
6	To what extent does the call for proposals request a strategy for building the capacity of training providers within government, civil society, and/or the private or		

<sup>18</sup> Please insert a 5 if the criterion is fully met, a 4 if it is mostly met, a 3 if it is partly met but requires improvement, a 2 if it is mentioned or lightly touched upon but not met, and a 1 if it is not met/included.

	voluntary sectors?		
	<b>Direct Assistance</b>		
<b>7</b>	To what extent does the call for proposals state that direct assistance activities can only be included in applications where they are linked with capacity building objectives in a clear manner via on-the-job learning, mentorship, or other approaches?		
<b>8</b>	To what extent does the call for proposals request that applicants provide a detailed strategy for how their direct assistance activities will identify and target the most vulnerable?		
	<b>Regional Migration Dialogue</b>		
<b>9</b>	To what extent does the call for proposals indicate that regional dialogue activities should be accompanied by a strategy to promote tangible progress (or accountability) among participating governments?		
	<b>Coordination</b>		
<b>10</b>	To what extent does the call for proposals ask how proposed program activities will be coordinated with other UN agencies and other relevant stakeholders? Coordination should be divided into subcategories such as de-confliction, cooperation, and joint financing or fundraising.		
	<b>Emergency Migration Management</b>		
<b>11</b>	To what extent does the call for proposals specifically ask bidders to include not only trainings but also contingency planning and preparedness exercises under this pillar?		
<b>12</b>	To what extent does the call for proposals instruct applicants to mainstream EMM into capacity building and direct assistance activities?		
	<b>Monitoring, Evaluation, &amp; Learning</b>		
<b>13</b>	To what extent does the call for proposals require/request a clear M&E strategy that revolves around outcomes and impacts – particularly with regards to capacity building?		
<b>14</b>	To what extent does the call for proposals instruct applicants to include adequate funds (around 5% of the total amount) for M&E and related activities, such as evidence-based learning?		
<b>15</b>	To what extent does the call for proposals require/request a strategy for gaining anonymous		

	feedback, including numerical assessments and ideas for improvement, from government officials and from migrants?		
	<b>Other</b>		
<b>16</b>	To what extent does the call for proposals require that applicants submit a handover or exit strategy with accompanying timeline?		
<b>17</b>	To what extent does the call for proposals encourage applicants to fully fund program staff rather than including large numbers of individuals who will divide their time on this program with several other programs?		
	<b>TOTAL</b>		

*The line-by-line scores would be added in order to create a composite score. Calls for proposals could not be approved for release unless they meet a minimum threshold such as 65/85 or greater.*

## Checklist 2: Reviewing Proposals for the Regional Migration Programs

The following list of criteria is based on this evaluation, including the review of good practices contained in the desk review and the findings of the two regional evaluations in the Horn of Africa and Mesoamerica. DoS/PRM should use this checklist to assess proposals or other program documents developed by IOM and any future applicants.

No.	Criteria	Score (1 5) <sup>19</sup>	Notes
<b>Capacity Building</b>			
<b>1</b>	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials provide an explanation of how capacity building needs were systematically identified through credible data analysis and (not or) stakeholder consultations?		
<b>2</b>	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials provide a strategy for engaging with civil service training academies or border/migration institutes?		
<b>3</b>	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials provide a strategy to create an enabling environment for capacity building (e.g., gaining commitments from governments to retain trained individuals and exercise newly acquired skills)?		
<b>4</b>	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials reflect a graduated approach to capacity building that goes from introductory to expert material – as opposed to a one-off approach?		
<b>5</b>	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials include hands-on learning opportunities, including roleplays, simulations, and on-the-job trainings?		
<b>6</b>	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials offer a strategy for building the capacity of training providers within government, civil society, and/or the private or voluntary sectors?		
<b>Direct Assistance</b>			
<b>7</b>	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials link direct assistance activities with capacity building objectives in a clear manner via on-the-job learning, mentorship, or other approaches?		

<sup>19</sup> Please insert a 5 if the criterion is fully met, a 4 if it is mostly met, a 3 if it is partly met but requires improvement, a 2 if it is mentioned or lightly touched upon but not met, and a 1 if it is not met/included.

8	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials provide a detailed strategy for how direct assistance activities will identify and target the most vulnerable?		
<b>Regional Migration Dialogue</b>			
9	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials offer a strategy to promote tangible progress (or accountability) among governments participating in regional migration dialogues (even where those processes are voluntary and non-binding)?		
<b>Coordination</b>			
10	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials show how proposed program activities will be coordinated with other UN agencies and other relevant stakeholders? Coordination should be divided into subcategories such as de-confliction, cooperation, and joint financing or fundraising.		
<b>Emergency Migration Management</b>			
11	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials specifically ask bidders to include not only trainings but also contingency planning and preparedness exercises under this pillar?		
12	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials instruct applicants to mainstream EMM into capacity building and direct assistance activities?		
<b>Monitoring, Evaluation, &amp; Learning</b>			
13	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials provide a clear M&E strategy that revolves around outcomes and impacts – particularly with regards to capacity building?		
14	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials include adequate funds (around 5% of the total amount) for M&E and related activities, such as evidence-based learning?		
15	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials provide a clear strategy for gaining anonymous feedback, including numerical assessments and ideas for improvement, from government officials and from migrants?		
<b>Other</b>			
16	To what extent do the proposal or other application		

	materials include a handover or exit strategy with accompanying timeline (and/or information on progress against an earlier handover strategy)?		
<b>17</b>	To what extent do the proposal or other application materials show that program staff will be fully (or almost fully) funded under this program rather than split across several different projects or programs?		

*The line-by-line scores would be added in order to create a composite score. Successful proposals would be required to meet a minimum threshold such as 65/85 or greater.*

### Checklist 3: Monitoring Tools for Regional Migration Programs in the Field

This checklist/worksheet is intended to support DoS/PRM personnel in monitoring the Regional Migration Programs (RMPs) in the field. This tool should be treated as a core tool which nonetheless could be supplemented by questions or issues specific to each region in question. Maintaining the following criteria, however, would allow DoS/PRM to compare performance across regions on an annual or semi-annual basis.

Section 1: Who Did You Consult?					
Stakeholder Type	Men	Women	Minors	Total	Notes/Methods
IOM staff				##	
National government				##	
Subnational/local government				##	
Other UN or NGO				##	
Beneficiary/migrant/returnee				##	
Other				##	
<b>Total</b>				<b>##</b>	

Section 2: Pillar by Pillar Assessments			
No.	Criteria	Score (1-5)	Explanation (incl. gender dimensions)
<b>2.1</b>	<b><i>Capacity Building</i></b>		
2.1.1	Capacity building activities are rooted in a detailed assessment of capacity needs and pathways to change		
2.1.2	The “right people” appear to be targeted, with a focus on those officials who have regular contact with migrants		
2.1.3	Improvements in knowledge among training participants		
2.1.4	Improvements/changes in attitudes among participants		
2.1.5	Improvements in capabilities and skills among participants		
2.1.6	Tangible change in how migrants are treated and the services available to them as a result of capacity building		
2.1.7	Use of hand-on learning opportunities, including simulations and roleplays		
2.1.8	Overall reach of capacity building is being maximized, including through training of trainers, e-learning, and other methods		
2.1.9	Incorporation of IOM capacity building		



	methods into core public institutions, including through training institutes and other permanent entities		
	<b>Capacity Building Total</b>	<b>##</b>	
<b>2.2</b>	<b><i>Direct Assistance</i></b>		
2.2.1	Direct assistance activities are urgently needed and high in quality		
2.2.2	Direct assistance activities are closely linked with capacity building		
2.2.3	The most vulnerable are the sole or primary beneficiaries of direct assistance activities		
2.2.4	Direct assistance only fills gaps that others, including government and civil society, cannot address		
	<b>Direct Assistance Total</b>	<b>##</b>	
<b>2.3</b>	<b><i>Regional Migration Dialogues</i></b>		
2.3.1	Regional consultative processes (RCPs) meet on a regular basis		
2.3.2	RCPs focus on one issue and affect change before moving on to others		
2.3.3	Recommendations from past RCP meetings are being turned into tangible changes		
2.3.4	An accountability mechanism of some variety is in place to promote action among member governments		
2.3.5	Voices from civil society and local or subnational officials are reflected at RCP meetings		
	<b>Regional Migration Dialogues Total</b>	<b>##</b>	
<b>2.4</b>	<b><i>IOM UNHCR Coordination</i></b>		
2.4.1	IOM and UNHCR are cooperating on the identification and referral of migrants and refugees		
2.4.2	IOM, UN agencies, and other relevant stakeholders are de-conflicting their activities and avoiding actual or perceived competition		
2.4.3	Joint activities are being held among IOM and other relevant agencies, particularly in relation to capacity building (e.g., joint trainings or participation in one another's capacity building activities)		
2.4.4	Funding proposals have been developed		

	or are being developed between IOM and other relevant UN agencies		
	<b>IOM-UNHCR Coordination Total</b>	<b>##</b>	
<b>2.5</b>	<b><i>Emergency Migration Management</i></b>		
2.5.1	The Emergency Migration Management (EMM) pillar is combining capacity building with tangible activities such as contingency planning		
2.5.2	Drills, exercises, and other hands-on processes are being held – pulling together relevant governmental entities with civil society, consulates, international organizations, and other relevant entities		
2.5.3	IOM has taken advantages of opportunities to integrate EMM (and associated components like MICIC and Migration in Crises Operational Framework (MCOF)) into routine capacity building activities		
	<b>Emergency Migration Mgmt. Total</b>	<b>##</b>	
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>##</b>	

<b>Section 3: Learning and Accountability</b>			
No.	Question	Score (1-5)	Narrative explanation (3-5 sentences each); please include examples where feasible
3.1	To what extent is IOM gathering feedback from government officials?		
3.2	To what extent is IOM learning from AND acting on that feedback?		
3.3	To what extent is IOM gathering feedback in a safe/anonymous manner from migrant beneficiaries?		
3.4	To what extent is IOM learning from AND acting on that feedback?		
3.5	To what extent are IOM staff aware of any applicable monitoring and evaluation plan?		
3.6	To what extent is IOM gathering routine monitoring data during activities?		
3.7	To what extent is IOM gaining data on the outcomes of their		

	activities (e.g., the impact of capacity building activities on job performance)?		
3.8	To what extent is IOM aggregating, analyzing, and learning internally – at all levels – from monitoring data in each region?		
<b>Section 3 Total</b>			

Section 4: Good Practices and Room for Improvement	
What are some good practices from this region that should be shared with others involved in RMPs elsewhere in the world?	What are some recommendations for strengthening the RMP in this region? Please specify who should be responsible for making these changes and over what time period?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> <li>▪</li> </ul>

Section 5: Other Comments
Please use the box below to offer any additional reflections on the program that do not necessarily correspond to the other sections of this worksheet.
<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 150px; width: 100%;"></div>